THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it possible to find some middle term to describe our Lord? Some term that will show Him not merely man and not wholly God? Would 'Son of God' do? Thomas said, 'My Lord and my God': may we say, 'My Lord and my Son of God'?

Some such term the DEAN OF CARLISLE is evidently in need of. He does not believe that Jesus was God, and he does not believe that He was merely man. If he believed that He was merely man he would be a Unitarian. But a Unitarian he is not. Most emphatically he declares himself no Unitarian. 'If there are any people calling themselves Unitarians who feel they could with sincerity use such language of Christ, [as he himself is prepared to use] then of course they are not really Unitarians.'

Under the title of *Jesus Human and Divine* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net), Dr. RASHDALL has published three sermons in which he vindicates himself from the charges made against him by the newspapers. The charges were made on the basis of reports of his Cambridge address. These reports appear to have been untrue, and sometimes unfair. And the charges which were based upon them repeated the untruth and doubled the unfairness. He defends himself indignantly.

And he does well to be indignant. But if there were any honest and accurate men among his reporters and editors he does not help them much. He does not tell them how it can be that Jesus of Nazareth was more than man and less than God. The Apostle Paul had evidently a firm belief in Beings of a middle order between God and man. But the DEAN OF CARLISLE does not share that belief. What will he have us call this Man who was divine as no other man is divine? Where will he send us to find Him?

During the War, and for some little time after it, the belief was freely expressed that the willing sacrifice of a man's life for his country cancelled past shortcoming, whether of faith or of morals, and opened the gate of heaven. The assurance gave much comfort to parents and friends. Then some zealous evangelical called it salvation by heroism, and the comfort of it came to an end. For how does salvation by heroism differ from salvation by works? And we know that by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight.

Is that the end, then? It is not. Dr. Edward LYTTELTON has raised the question again in his *Letters on Education*, noticed on another page. He has raised it unintentionally, even unconsciously, but he has raised it. For the sole purpose of these letters is to prove that salvation is deliverance from self. Teach the children, he says, to get rid of their ego, to get rid of all reference to their own interests; teach them to turn their thoughts to God and to refer all their affairs to His will and approval, and you educate them. That is what he says. He could as certainly say, 'and you save them.'

But the men did that. What happened in October 1914? Dr. LYTTELTON asks the question. And answers: 'A million of our young men came forward cheerfully and gave themselves—all they had, all they were—gave themselves cheerfully, as any one could see—gave themselves heroically, as we afterwards saw, for their country.' Whatever self had been to them hitherto, it was nothing to them now. They counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might win—what? Clearly salvation, heaven. And clearly they won it.

Dr. John Watson had much wrestling in his day with this matter. He threw his understanding of it at last into the story of Mr. Saunderson's housekeeper. 'Mr. Saunderson had a housekeeper whose name was Mrs. Pitillo, and he tells us of her gifts in the following strain:—

'"She had the episcopal faculty in quite a conspicuous degree, and was, I have often thought, a woman of sound judgment.

'"We were not able at all times to see eye to eye, as she had an unfortunate tendency to meddle with my books and papers, and to arrange them after an artificial fashion. This she called tidying, and in its most extreme form, cleaning. With all her excellences, there was also in her what I have noticed in most women, a flavour of guile, and on one occasion, when I was making a brief journey through Holland and France in search of comely editions of the Fathers, she had the books carried out into the garden and dusted. It was the space of two years before I regained mastery of my library again, and unto this day I cannot lay my hands on the Service-book of King Henry VIII., which I had in the second edition, or Rutherford's 'Lex Rex.' It does not become me, however, to reflect on the efforts of that worthy woman, and, if any one could be saved by good works, her place is assured. I was with her before she died, and her last words to me were, 'Tell Jean tae dust yir bukes ance in sax months, and for ony sake keep ae chair for sittin' on.' It was not perhaps the testimony one would have desired in the circumstances, but yet, Mr. Carmichael, I have often thought that there was a spirit of—of unselfishness, in fact, that showed the working of grace."'

That is Dr. Watson. But Dr. Watson was not an evangelical? Very well. Was Dr. Alexander Whyte an evangelical? One day, in his pulpit in Edinburgh, Dr. Whyte was expounding the parable of the Good Samaritan. Suddenly he stopped. With a flash of his eye—that glare they knew, and called it so—he swept the congregation before him. 'But,' he said. Now notice what he said.

The text was, 'Go, and do thou likewise.' It was the Lord's last word to the lawyer who stood up and tempted Him. 'But,' said Dr. Whyte, 'some lawyer here, willing to justify himself, will stand up to tempt me, and will demand of me whether I mean to deny all my late sermons on the Romans? And to teach to-night that this Samaritan was justified before God simply because of this good deed of his? I quite admit that both our Lord and His Apostle sometimes teach economically, and paradoxically, and one-sidedly even, on occasion. All the same,—go you and do you as this good Samaritan did. And if death and judgment overtake you walking beside your mule on the way to the inn at Jericho: or if your Lord summons you to give in your account when you are up smoothing the pillow of a half-dead enemy of yours; I would far rather take your chance of eternal life than if death and judgment overtook you still debating, however Calvinistically, about your evangelical duty. Yes: Go at once to-night and do likewise.'

Is not that salvation by heroism? If not, it only lacks the hero. But, you say, surely evangelicalism demands faith—faith in God, faith in Christ. Surely it does. And it shall have it.

Had your million of heroes in October 1914 no faith? Why did they offer themselves? Says Dr. Lyttelton: 'Any stranger would surely have expected us to deride these fellows as a swarm of lunatics. Did we? We did not; and if anyone showed the least inclination to disparage their conduct in the slightest degree we loaded him with unmeasured vituperation.' For the offering they made was made in faith.

It was faith in king, in country, in their homes, in father or mother, in wife, in children. But that is faith in God. That is faith in Christ. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these, ye did it unto me.' Not, ye did it just as if ye were doing it unto Me. Ye did it unto Me.

For He is one with His brethren. He is identified with them. He and they are inseparable. He is in them. They are in Him. Boundaries are banished. Physical barriers are swept off. Faith in wife and child, though they are so near to self, is faith in Christ. For it is not self; it is the denial of self. It sends a man into the firing line, where there is no room for self to be.

Messrs. Macmillan have issued the second volume of that elaborate work on the Acts of the Apostles which is edited by Professor F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and Professor Kirsopp Lake, and which itself is part of a still larger work entitled *The Beginnings of Christianity*. This volume includes the second part of the Prolegomena to Acts and the Criticism (24s. net).

It is a composite production, curiously composite. For not only are nine different writers' work in it, in addition to that of the Editors themselves, but there are three appendixes, all (somewhat remotely) bearing on the matters discussed, one of them an insurmountable surprise. The Editors tell the story of Margaret Catchpole and occupy twenty pages with it.

One of the writers is Professor F. C. Burkitt. It is he that expresses most unreservedly the purpose for which the book is written. That purpose is to estimate the historical value of the Acts of the Apostles. He divides the book into two parts. The historical value of the second part he probably rates higher than that of the first part. It is of the first twelve chapters that he gives his opinion.

He asks the question: 'What reason, then, have we for trusting the narrative of the first twelve chapters of Acts? Or rather, what measure of credence ought we to give them?' And he answers, 'Roughly, this: we should give them much the same measure of credence that we give to the story of the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem as related in Luke, as compared with the story in Mark. It seems to me that this measure of credence may be compared with that which we give to Shakespeare's *Henry V.* as compared with Hall's *Chronicle*. Shakespeare's play is very much more than a work of fancy. If we knew nothing about the great Lancastrian except what we get from Shakespeare, we should still have a great deal of solid information. We should know the outlines of the history and the heroic story of Agincourt. We should also have a not unhistorical picture of the character of the heroic king, drawn for us by a great literary genius. Something of this is what we have in the Lucan writings. In the Gospel we can partially control the author's tale, for we possess one of his sources. In the Acts we are almost entirely dependent on what he has chosen to tell us.'

Four authors discuss the identity of the editor (not author, you observe) of the Third Gospel and the Acts. The result is unexpected. One of the authors is Mr. C. W. Emmet. Now he would be a hardy unbeliever who would accuse Mr. Emmet of giving the case away to the traditionalist. Yet Mr. Emmet finds the Acts and the Epistles in agreement, and not substantially only, but even in detail. And Herr Windisch, who is appointed to answer him, does not weaken the force of one of his arguments.

But the essay of deepest interest has been contributed by the Editors themselves. It goes by the title of 'The Internal Evidence of Acts.' It is long and loose. The whole volume gives the impression of indifference to space and time. But as the end approaches we find ourselves among matters of utmost importance.

There is, first of all, a comparison between the three Synoptists in respect of their primary purpose. Mark, we are told, had the single object of persuading his readers that Jesus was the Messiah, 'in spite of the fact that Jesus himself had not proclaimed this openly.' Matthew accepts the position of Mark, but goes a step further. He seeks to prove that Jesus gave a new Law, a Law which He intended should not merely supplement but take the place of the Law of Moses. Luke also accepts the position of Mark, and also goes beyond it. His special contribution is the claim that the Christian community is a Church, and the evidence that was required to support that claim.

More striking than that, more striking to the Editors as well as to us, is the discovery, if it is a discovery, that the theology of Acts and the theology of Paul represent separate lines of development.

They announce it as a discovery. For hitherto even the most radical critics have been under the influence of the tradition that Luke was a disciple of Paul, and so have searched for traces of Paulinism in Acts. But 'Acts and Paul are singularly independent of each other, for sometimes one and sometimes the other seems to be the more advanced, and there is no satisfactory evidence that either borrows from the other.'

They find three sets of facts which go to prove the truth of this discovery. First, the word 'Christ' is used differently. In Acts it is a title; in Paul it has become a name. Next, there is little or no soteriology in Acts. The crucifixion is simply a Jewish crime, its value for reconciliation has not been reached. And, thirdly, 'the interpretation of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah as a reference to the Messiah is markedly characteristic of Luke but is not found in Paul, although one would have supposed that, had he known it, Paul would certainly have made use of it to support his soteriological arguments.'

Does all that signify that the Acts is earlier than the Pauline Epistles? It seems to point that way. But the Editors will not have it. They hasten to say that the only conclusion we can come to is that Luke and Paul represent two lines of development in Christian thought.

But the most striking comparison with the writings of Luke is not offered by any book in the New Testament. It is offered by the Apostles' Creed.

Taking the Third Gospel and the Acts together, the Editors find certain articles of belief and set them forth in this way:

'(1) God, as
    (*a*) the Creator of the World, and
    (*b*) the Father of the Lord and of his People.
(2) Jesus, the Christ, as
    (*a*) the Son of God, born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary;
    (*b*) the Lord,
        who suffered under Pontius Pilate and Herod, died, was buried, rose again on the third day, ascended

into Heaven, sits at God's right hand, and is coming to judge the world.
(3) The Holy Spirit.
(4) The Church.
(5) Baptism, and the Apostolic Laying on of hands.
(6) The Forgiveness of Sins.
(7) The Resurrection of the Dead.'

The likeness to the Apostles' Creed is evident enough. But it becomes still more evident if the remarks of K. HOLL to the Berlin Academy in January 1919 are taken into account. HOLL points out that the second article of the Creed begins with a double description of Jesus Christ as 'the only-begotten Son of God' and 'our Lord,' and that then this double description is explained by two paragraphs, each beginning with the article—'who was born (τὸν γεννηθέντα) of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,' and 'who was crucified' (τὸν . . . σταυρωθέντα). This is in closest correspondence with the doctrine of Luke, who alone treats the Divine Sonship of Jesus as beginning with His birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.

There are thus two types of doctrine in the documents which have been preserved. And now 'the problem which is opened up for the Church historian is to distinguish, so far as possible, the traces of that type of Christianity which is represented by the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and the Apostles' Creed, from that other great line of thought, ultimately triumphant, which is represented by the later epistles of St. Paul, by the Fourth Gospel, and by the Alexandrian School of theology, and found final expression in the Nicene Creed.'

It is surprising to see how completely in a single generation the centre of interest has changed from the Old Testament to the New. Careful observers tell us that in the United States of America a great upheaval is at hand over the Old Testament. In Great Britain we are clean past that. We are occupied now with the more vital problems of the New.

And the focus of interest is the Fourth Gospel. The intensity of interest in the Fourth Gospel is manifest in many ways. Some men are giving themselves to a discussion of its structure, some to an investigation of its contents, some to the keener question of its authorship. But for the moment the most absorbing interest of all is the study of its sources.

To that interest the latest contribution has been made by Dr. C. F. BURNEY, Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford. It is no less than an attempt to prove that the Fourth Gospel was written in Aramaic.

Professor BURNEY does not say that the Greek we have is simply the translation of an Aramaic original. What he says, and what he believes he can prove, is that an Aramaic original underlies the present Greek Gospel. He believes he can prove that there was a Gospel written in Aramaic, which was translated into Greek, with freedom on the part of the translator, and with some faults. He believes he can prove that that Aramaic Gospel was substantially the Gospel which we now call 'according to St. John.'

His book is entitled *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 16s. net). To do its distinguished author justice the book must be read. All that can be attempted here is to touch at one or two of the places where he seems to make persuasive points.

His work on the Prologue is based on an article contributed by Dr. C. J. Ball to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1909. But he has worked through the literature of the subject for himself, and in particular has missed no scrap of linguistic worth thrown up by the papyri or ostraka. Above all, he has rigidly refused to accept as evidence of translation from the Aramaic words or phrases which may be traced to the Septuagint. He has remembered that the Septuagint diction is Hebraic—a different thing from an Aramaic diction.

Look first at the notes on the Prologue. In v.[5] we read: 'And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.' That is the Authorized Version. The Revised Version has 'apprehended,' with 'overcame' in the margin, and a reference to Jn 12[35], 'Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not'—the same Greek word. The Greek word is κατέλαβεν. Now if this Greek word were turned into Aramaic, it would be represented there by a word which is very like another word meaning 'to darken.' Take it that the Greek translator mistook the one word for the other. We have then the excellent sense: 'The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness obscured it not.' The sense 'obscure,' adds Dr. Burney, equally suits Jn 12[35]: 'that darkness shroud you not.'

In v.[14] we read: 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' The Greek verb translated 'dwelt' is ἐσκήνωσεν, tented, tabernacled (RVm.), from σκηνή, 'a tent.' It is a curious verb to use. Dr. Burney believes that it was suggested to the Greek translator by its resemblance to the Semitic root *s-k-n*, which appears in the Hebrew *Shekinah* and in the Aramaic *Shekinta*. The Aramaic word is freely used in the Targums. Hebrew passages which represent Yahweh as dwelling, or causing His name to dwell, in the midst of Israel, are represented in the Targums by the phrase, 'He caused His Shekinta to dwell' there.

Let us pass from the Prologue. More striking are certain mistranslations found in other parts of the Gospel. Take 7[38]: 'He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' What does it mean? Westcott says the thought is the distribution of the blessing in fuller measure by its recipient. It may be so. But where is the scripture? It has not been found. Try the Aramaic.

In Aramaic the word for 'belly' is closely similar to the word for 'fountain.' Suppose that the one was mistaken for the other. We find the scripture then, for Joel speaks of a fountain that 'shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim' (3[18]). Is there any difficulty in rivers of water flowing out of a fountain? Dr. Burney changes the punctuation. This is his translation:

'He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me;
And let him drink that believeth in Me.

As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.'

Take a last example. In 8[56] we read: 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.' The Greek is 'rejoiced *in order that he might see*' (ἵνα ἴδῃ)—a plainly impossible construction, and yet the word used (ἵνα) cannot be translated otherwise than 'in order that.' And then there is the tautology. If Abraham rejoiced to see, to say that he saw and was glad is to say the same thing over again.

Try the Aramaic. The verb meaning 'to rejoice' also means 'to long for.' In that meaning it is not found in W. Aramaic, but it occurs in Syriac. Its construction would naturally be with ἵνα. Whereupon we have the excellent meaning: 'Your father Abraham longed to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.'

Every man has his own working theory of the Person of Christ. He has it chiefly from tradition. But he does not simply swallow the terms in which the men who were before him embodied their belief. He does not play at the children's game of shut your eyes and open your mouth. He considers what the traditional interpretation means for him. He considers it in the light (or darkness) of other men's theories. Above all he considers it in the light of Scripture.

John Huntley SKRINE has his theory. Dr. SKRINE is a scholar. He has been Fellow of an Oxford College and Bampton Lecturer. He is a Doctor of Divinity. Above all he is himself. To an unusually close acquaintance with the mind of his fathers he adds an unusually independent mind of his own. This is not the first time that he has surprised us by his originality. But this is the greatest surprise.

For, so far as we know, it is the first time in the history of theology that the theory of the Person of Christ worked out by Dr. SKRINE has been suggested. He would himself know if it had been suggested before. He does not hint that it has been. He has worked it out by himself alone, using the materials that were ready to his hand in the Gospels.

What are these materials? They are certain facts about a certain person, Jesus of Nazareth, whose life's story is told by four historians. It is not necessary that Dr. SKRINE should accept every one of these facts as historically reliable. It is enough if there are reliable facts to form a judgment on—a judgment of the Person whose story they relate. For it is with the Person, and the Person only, that he has to do.

There are such facts. Dr. SKRINE has formed his judgment. This man, Jesus of Nazareth, differed from other men. He differed from other men in this that in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. That is a Pauline phrase, but it is expressive and it is true. Nevertheless keep to your historians. What they say is that all the powers of God filled all the vessel of His manhood, so that He was one with God in vital union. There was nothing that God could do for a man that was not done for Him. There was nothing that a man could receive from God that was not received by Him. That is how they represent Him, as they knew Him or were informed of Him. That is the portrait they draw of Him. It is consistent and it is credible. We see and believe it.

Then, when the time came, this man was received into the Godhead. Not His manhood. There is no such thing as manhood. There are only men. This one man, this man alone—for no other of the sons of men has ever had the fulness of God residing in him—this man was, when the time came, taken up into God. He was taken up as a man, and now exists, both God and man, the living, omnipresent, all-helpful Lord Jesus Christ.

When did the time come? It came when He ascended. Before He ascended He rose from the dead. And it is just this matter of the rising again from the dead that is the test of Dr. SKRINE's original theory.

He accepts the test. One chapter of his book—we have not named it, by the way. Its title is *The Gospel of the Manhood* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). One chapter of his book is occupied with the Resurrection.

Jesus rose from the dead. Not in the body. The body of Jesus did not rise. But He Himself rose. For the body is not an inseparable part of the personality. Jesus Himself rose from the dead, leaving His body behind Him. He appeared to His followers. He was taken up into God. He ever liveth to be the giver of life.

Two questions. What became of His body? And how can that be said to rise again which never was laid down?

Dr. SKRINE cannot answer the first question, though he tries to answer it. His words are these: 'I offer no solution of the problem which the narrative presents as to what happened to the body, though my expectation is that it will be solved, if ever, by one of two alternatives: either the tradition was mistaken and the body was disposed of in some unknown but natural manner, or else the same creative power which had brought into being the mortal frame withdrew it into nothingness. If the latter is the fact, there would be to ask why such special intervention of Deity was needed? I do not know what other reason suggests itself than that the witnesses, in the then state of psychologic knowledge, would have found it harder to accept the assurance of Jesus, "It is I Myself," if they had been sure that all the while Jesus was lying a corpse in Joseph's vault. They might have still believed that they were seeing but a ghost. This speculation will probably not seem very substantial, but I put it forward as the only conjecture I am able myself to form.'

The other question he takes no notice of.

Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology.

By C. J. Gadd, B.A., British Museum, London.

Thirty years represent not much less than half the total life of Assyriology, which is thus among the youngest of the sciences, and shows a tendency to rapid growth thoroughly in accordance with its age. What directions this progress has taken will be summarily indicated in the following survey of its principal departments. It would, of course, be impossible, in dealing with so immense a body of material, to trace the history of work accomplished, and it is proposed, therefore, to outline rather the position attained as the result of that work, omitting entirely, since completeness would be impossible and selection invidious, any reference to the many brilliant men who have laboured so fruitfully in this field.

I. Excavations and Archæology.

The year 1890 found three major explorations in progress on Mesopotamian sites. The oldest of these was also the most fruitful, and the remarkable discoveries at Tall Loh, the ancient Lagash, remain unsurpassed in interest, whether historical or archæological. Here it must be sufficient to say that they revealed a new and splendid art, especially notable in sculpture, as well as a long chapter of the earliest history. The remains were almost exclusively of the early Sumerian age, and they have since formed the canon by which similar objects from other sites have been judged and classified. But their particular importance resided in this, that they established, once for all, the position of the Sumerian race in early Babylonian history, and called at once into brilliant life a people whose very existence had been hitherto only a dark inference from the relics of their strange language. From the moment that the first inscribed statue of Gudea, or the Stele of the Vultures, came to light, the obstinate 'Sumerian question' was answered—against its raiser. And, further, it was now realized for the first time that the arts and culture of the later Babylonians stood in the direct tradition from this early people, among whom they were already in their full bloom. In the early third millennium B.C. the inhabitants of Lagash were already past masters in building, metal-work, and, above all, sculpture, both in relief and in the round, while in the beautiful craft of the gem-engraver they had attained a perfection never again to be equalled. From the stone heads discovered there emerged the physical characteristics of the race, which were strongly marked in the face, and the Sumerian type is now familiar, though the knowledge has not thrown much light upon the difficult question of the racial affinities of this people.

Meanwhile, in four expeditions, from 1888 onwards, an American mission excavated the ruins of the ancient Nippur, particularly those of the celebrated E-kur, or temple of Enlil, the most important shrine in ancient Babylonia. The construction of this temple was found to date back to Naram-Sin and Shar-gali-sharri, kings of Agade, but even below this level a deep bed of accumulated ruins served to indicate a much greater antiquity of the site. From a purely archæological standpoint the results of the digging were not so interesting as might have been hoped, but this was amply compensated by the discovery of a great mass of literary material, of which, however, this is not the place to speak. Babylon itself has been worked upon systematically by German excavators since 1899, up to the outbreak of the late war. Very high hopes were naturally entertained of so famous a site, but it cannot be denied that they have been largely disappointed. Nebuchadnezzar II., in the sixth century B.C., had been so thoroughly the Augustus of his city that he left little belonging to earlier ages, and his own splendours, which dazzled the eyes of Herodotus and Ctesias, have themselves so sadly faded that Babylon is indeed little but the 'shadow of a great name.' Nevertheless, it is not all disappointment; the magnitude of the city and its buildings, its walls and quays, its spacious planning, above all, its remarkable Sacred Way, paved with stone, leading between high walls, sculptured with lions in brickwork relief and coloured glaze, until it passes under the imposing Ishtar Gate with its façade of bulls and dragons depicted in the same striking technique—all these are still worthy remains of that royal capital which was once 'adorned as none other city that we wot of.'

If the enthusiasm of the German explorers had received something of a check at Babylon, it was to find a magnificent reward in another place. In 1903, operations were begun on the mound of Kalat Shargat, the ancient city of Ashur, and the site has, since then, yielded a rich and continuous stream of monuments, which have thrown an entirely new light upon the early history of the kingdom. But, apart from these, the architectural remains of temples and palaces, of the remarkable quay-wall of Adad-nirari I. (1300 B.C.), and of the city fortifications were in themselves no mean recompense for the labour expended in their excavation. A very important discovery, though rather of historical than archæological interest, was that of two parallel rows of stone monuments, found practically *in situ*, and running roughly east and west across an open square in the city. These were the memorials of men who had held the *limmu* office, or eponymate, including, of course, the kings themselves, who were distinguished from the commoners by having their monuments placed together in the northern row. In the lowest strata there came to light statues and fragments, in the characteristic early Sumerian style of sculpture and dress, and it is significant that another such statuette has been found lower down the Tigris in the neighbourhood of Samarra.

Space forbids more than a passing reference to some highly interesting finds at Tall Halaf in the extreme north of Mesopotamia on the Habur River. This place is now known to be the site of Guzana, that Gozan to which Sargon sent Israelite prisoners after the fall of Samaria; it has yielded the figure of a veiled goddess and a number of stone reliefs in the curious mixed style of art found at Sinjirli and (later) at Carchemish, which is doubtless predominantly Aramæan, though tinged with Hittite influences. But we must now leave Mesopotamia itself, and glance at two other widely separated regions, both of which have now definitely entered the range of our survey. First of these is the ancient Elam, where Susa, the capital city, has been explored since 1897 by a French mission with brilliant results. It is strange indeed that this foreign city should have given us some of the finest specimens of purely Babylonian art and culture. For Naram-Sin's stele of victory, Manishtusu's obelisk, and Hammurabi's laws we are indebted to the somewhat undiscriminating taste of one Shutruk-Nahhunte, who obtained them as the spoil of a successful foray. This implies, of course, that at Susa Babylonian influence is more in evidence than any purely native art. But the Elamites at least learned well, and have some highly creditable achievements in stone and metal work. They showed most originality in their seals (which at first imitated those of Babylonia neither in shape nor in design), and in their pottery, which flourished in its most perfect attainment in the earliest days of the city. There is an evident connexion between the geometrical and naturalistic designs on the early seals and on the best painted pottery. It is in this respect that Susa presents the greatest contrast with purely Babylonian sites, upon which the pottery is usually plain and uninteresting, though very early red and black sherds have been found at Ashur, and recently a quantity of such fragments, with black naturalistic designs on a plain ground, have been found in the British Museum excavations at Eridu and in the small mound called Tall al-Ubaid; comparison with the early Susian pottery is suggested at once. It is possible that such ware would be found in other Babylonian mounds, if digging were carried down to a sufficient depth, which has very seldom been done hitherto.

One other site, far removed from the last, must be noticed before this brief survey ends. Boghaz-Keui is a modern village in Cappadocia, lying in the bend of the Halys, east of Angora; but above it stand the remains of the city of Hatti, once the heart of the Hittite empire, in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. This fact was revealed by the discoveries made in 1906 and 1907, when the cuneiform records, which almost immediately came to light, disclosed to the explorer that he had chanced upon a far more important prize than that which he had set out to seek. These same records proved to add a whole new wing, as it were, to the history of Western Asia in ancient times, and incidentally a new language to those which already existed for the more discomfiture of Assyriologists. But of these things and of the connexion of the Hittite use of cuneiform with the 'Cappadocian' traders of Cæsarea, this is not the place to speak. Boghaz-Keui was not merely the site of a royal archive; it was in itself a city of imposing proportions, with temple, palace, and fortifications complete, and all of stone, at least in their lower courses. The city wall was of enormous strength, with its outer and inner facing of stone filled in with rubble, the whole surmounted by towers and pierced with gates, each side of which was formed by huge incurving monoliths, with more than a slight suggestion of Mycenæ. In front of this wall there ran also, in the weaker places, an outwork of lighter build. Sculptured lions, forming part of a water-trough in the temple courtyard, and others which flanked the entrance of the southern gate, together with a fine life-sized relief of a king at the east gate, were characteristic products of the sculptural art found at many other places in the Hittite country, from which we can obtain an excellent notion of the national dress, with its pointed cap and upturned shoes, of the form and worship of the gods, and of the physical type of the people.

II. History.

In no department that we shall have to survey has our progress been so rapid, and withal so definitive, as in that of history. This, of course, is not always the case with ancient studies, in illustration of which it would be possible to quote Crete, and even Egypt. Assyriologists, on the other hand, are fortunate enough to be able to follow a virtually unbroken thread from the latest times to the earliest (historically speaking) in Western Asia. Latest to earliest—that is the natural order of recovery by the spade. A thread, too, it is indeed, and occasionally a slender one, but even a thread can unpuzzle a labyrinth. Let it be said at once, therefore, that the study of that portion of history which may roughly be defined as derived from cuneiform sources has been at once progressive and centrifugal; progressive, that is, ever further into the past (if the apparent paradox be permissible), and centrifugal in the sense that it now yields a picture of much more than the mere centre from which the cuneiform script radiated. Babylonia and Assyria were not one in descent any more than in politics; the latter was not merely an upstart younger brother of the former. But, more than this, the land of the two rivers was surrounded by neighbours, mostly alien in race, whose own history could not fail to have a profound effect upon that of the two nations. The great event of more recent historical study has been the entrance of these mighty forces from the circumference. To this phenomenon even the remarkable extension of our knowledge concerning the early period of internal development must take second place. In order to give due importance to both of these features it will perhaps be most perspicuous, and most conformable to the limits of space, to make a very summary sketch of the early period as a whole, rather than to attempt a geographical arrangement.

The years about 3000 B.C. form a convenient beginning for the definite history of Babylonia, or rather of Sumer, for it is there that the past first becomes articulate. Perhaps, indeed, before that time, for we now have lists of dynasties and kings which profess to extend back even to the Deluge. But in those days the gods still walked on earth, and Etana, Lugal-banda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh himself, shepherds or hunters as they were among men, ruled from their cities of Kish or Erech for their hundreds of years, alternately with many mortal kings of more than patriarchal longevity. The picture is fancifully coloured, but the drawing is accurate enough, and represents Sumer as it was yet to be for many centuries—a congeries of city-states in a condition of perpetual warfare, each under its own governor, contesting the 'kingship,' which passed from city to city according as each was able, for the time, to assert its supremacy over the others. Eleven of these 'cities of kingship' were reckoned by the scribes before the rule passed finally to Babylon. These include most of the ancient centres of Sumer itself, but, what is more remarkable, the 'lands' have already intruded themselves, and four out of the eleven names are those of foreign cities—Awan and Hamazi in Elam, Mari on the middle Euphrates, and the 'horde' of Gutians, who were simply north-eastern hill tribes. Of the very early dynasties we have no monuments,—writing was probably not yet invented,—but gradually the rise and fall of cities begins to make its way into light independent of the king-lists, as when Enshakushanna of Erech relates his own defeat of Kish under Enbi-Ishtar. A succeeding rule of Adab is also attested by inscriptions; then the power goes to Mari, under the suzerainty of which we may place the brilliant local line of kings inaugurated by Ur-Nina at Lagash. It is a curious freak of chance that this bypath of Sumerian history should be so brilliantly illumined while the main road passes by, only just discernible in the gloom. But the ways join in Urukagina, the last king of Lagash, who was overthrown by Lugal-zaggisi, king of Erech and of all the land. A great conqueror his own inscriptions proclaim him to be, but he was defeated in his turn by an even greater, the celebrated Sargon of Agade. About this man, as about the recent recovery of his true place and importance in history, a fascinating account might be written, if space permitted. But of his date and of his exploits something must be said. It appears certain that we must adopt what seemed at first a too-heroic remedy, and accuse Nabonidus' scribe of exactly a thousand years error in his date of 3750 B.C. for Naram-Sin, the great-grandson of Sargon. It had always seemed improbable, from the time that the early Babylonians and their art began to be known, and, in face of the lists, it is out of the question. Decreased by a thousand—and the difference is only that of a single wedge in cuneiform—the date agrees excellently with all the evidence, and is doubtless authentic, so that we may confidently mark 2750 B.C. as the *floruit* of Naram-Sin. As to the achievements of Sargon and his dynasty, we are not on such sure ground. From his own inscriptions we know that, after reducing all Babylonia, he marched up to the Lebanon, to the 'silver mountains' of the Taurus, and to the Syrian coast. It is clear also that he fought, like his successors, in Elam. But some very far-reaching claims have recently been made, involving the whole of Asia Minor, and even the distant island of Crete! It is by no means certain, however, that the evidence adduced will bear so great a weight. A similar doubt attaches to the conquests of Naram-Sin, and here again the difficulties are mainly those of geographical identification. The assumption that Magan was some part of Egypt may yet prove to have started inquirers on some very false scents.

Of the long domination of the tribes from across the Tigris, known as Gutians, nothing need be said, for scarce anything is known. It is clear that their rule was ineffective and sporadic, or the almost complete independence of Gudea at Lagash would have been impossible. They were evidently loose-knit and predatory hordes ('the host of Gutium had no king,' says the list), and their oppression was finally ended by one Utu-hegal of Erech, who has left us quite a heroic narrative of the last clash. But Erech was not to be the real inheritor of their kingdom, which was reserved rather for the great Third Dynasty of Ur. It would be impossible here to do justice to the power of these kings and to the unparaleled prosperity which the land enjoyed under their sway. But it is at this point that two new forces come into view, and change, for the first time known to history, the whole subsequent orientation of Babylonia's external policy.

The kingdom of Elam has recently been revealed to us by the excavations of Susa. Its inhabitants first appear as the makers of a fine painted pottery and the users of a script clearly distinguished from, yet probably related with, that of the Sumerians, which, however, was destined to disappear early in their history. Speculation as to the race, or even the language, of the Elamites is at present a step in the dark. But they appear first in history at the time of the Agade kings, whose empire clearly extended over Elam, as may be gathered from much scattered evidence. In those days, and for long afterwards, Elam was completely subservient to the reigning power in Sumer and Akkad, and this condition still held during the Ur Dynasty, though the date-lists make it clear that Shulgi and his successors had much hard fighting to do there. So much so, in fact, that their attention was turned exclusively eastwards, while on the west, after the reign of Ur-Nammu, they maintained a pure defensive. And it is remarkable that henceforth this remained the policy of Babylonia until its very latest days. Never was she free from periodical conflict with Elam, till Elam was annihilated by Ashurbanipal; never did she march again up the Euphrates until the Medes had annihilated Assyria. And this brings us at once to the other Babylonian frontier henceforth to be vital—the northern.

The suzerainty of Bur-Sin I. of Ur was acknowledged, far beyond the limits of Sumer, by one Zariku, governor of a city as yet obscure, but destined to so brilliant a future, the city of Ashur. Of the earlier history of this town we know no more than the names of two rulers, Ushpia and Kikia, who are designated as its first builders, and of the race of the Assyrians, beyond the fact that they were purely Semitic, nothing very precise can be made out. But there is solid ground for holding that their connexions are entirely with the west, despite the Biblical tradition of colonization from Babylon. At this same time of the Ur Dynasty, the city of Ashur was in close commercial relations with a group of Semitic traders, mostly bearing Assyrian names, settled in the neighbourhood of Cæsaræa Mazaca, beyond the Taurus, whose business records, disclosing an extensive trade in metals and woven stuffs, have been recovered in such a multitude from Kala Tepe and along the Habur. The activities of this settlement seem to have been very short-lived, but the race continued to live on in those regions, and was still known to Herodotus and other Greek writers as that of the White Syrians. There is, however, nothing to show that this outpost of Semites was in any way subject to Ashur, itself making at this time so humble a début in history. But this early bond with the west is a symptom of all subsequent Assyrian policy; all her effort is directed to the lands from which she drew the commodities essential to her welfare, and any interruption of these routes is the signal for her decline until connexion can be re-established. We have further glimpses of early Assyrian kings in their recently discovered monuments, and in a notice which brings Ilushuma into connexion with Sumu-abum, the first of Hammurabi's line in Babylon. It is evident that Assyria was now strongly in the ascendant, and there is some reason to believe that Sargon I. (to be sharply distinguished, of course, from Sargon of Agade, on the one hand, and the more familiar Sargon II. of Assyria, on the other) was a great conqueror; a seal impression bearing his name has been found on one of the Cappadocian tablets already mentioned. But, if so, his empire must have been evanescent, for soon after there ruled over Assyria a king with the name of Rim-Sin, and there is considerable probability that he was none other than Hammurabi's great rival, Rim-Sin of Larsa. Various successors, mentioned in the almost complete lists of Assyrian rulers which we now possess, are otherwise unknown.

Henceforth, apart from their internecine quarrels, the foreign horizons of Babylonia and Assyria respectively extended in opposite directions. The former was to find her problems continually in the eastern and south-eastern hills; invaded by wild Kassites, she was to see the rise of Elam to an independent and formidable kingdom to which she remained for many years a constant prey, while the line of monarchs, inaugurated by Humbanumena, achieved the summit of Elamite power. Assyria, on the other hand, looked ever west and north, often with anxious eyes. For her rise had been premature, and for many years she stood in peril of stifling almost at birth. One of the most striking results of recent research has been the revelation of the great masses of non-Semitic population which stretched across from Cilicia to the Caucasus, and which must inevitably have surged over any less virile nation than the Assyrians, whose survival and subsequent domination appear as one of the marvels of history when viewed in the midst of these sinister clouds. It is no slight test of the progress of ancient studies to reflect that the celebrated Amarnah letters were discovered only just before the time which this survey embraces. Since then an astonishing commentary has been added to these already astonishing documents by that remarkable combination of insight and pure luck which led to the finding of the Hittite archives at Boghaz-Keui, to the unveiling of a whole new civilization and of an ancient world-power. What were the precise relations of the Hittites, the Mitannians, the Urartians, and the people of smaller neighbouring kingdoms cannot as yet be settled with precision. It is, at any rate, unlikely that Indo-European elements, though undoubtedly present, were more than an admixture in the whole mass. It is best, at present, to consider all these kingdoms as political rather than racial entities, whose wax and wane was continual but did not affect anything more than the precise direction of the policy of Assyria. For instance, in the middle of the second millennium, Ashur was clearly under the domination of Hanigalbat, a kingdom lying east of the middle of the Taurus range, whereas later it was Mitanni and the Hittite power itself, or, later still, the Urartians of Armenia, who constituted the danger. Into the internal and mutual affairs of all these it is impossible here to enter, though the history of the Hittite kings who succeeded Shubbiluliuma, their relations with their neighbours, even with the Egypt of Rameses II., are all set forth at large in their treaties with these states, documents which surely form as notable a corpus of international law as any age could produce. With so advanced a civilization had Assyria to deal in her early days, and at first she was unequal to the task. But, after Ashur-uballiț, and his third successor, Adad-nirari I., had finally asserted the superiority of the growing state, Assyria never looked back, despite sporadic periods of partial decline, and, if she finally fell, we shall not impute it to lack of virtue in her people or policy in her rulers, if we consider what a world it was that she had so long been bearing upon her shoulders.

Literature.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

It is with peculiar gratification that we receive the third volume of *The Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 50s. net). Between the second and third volumes came the War, and Dr. Whitney's apology for the delay is readily accepted. The fear was that the War would end the enterprise. And that fear was greatly strengthened by the death of the principal Editor, Professor H. M. Gwatkin. But here it is, and not in any sense unworthy of the first or the second volume. Dr. Gwatkin's place has been filled by Dr. J. R. Tanner and Mr. C. W. Previté-Orton.

What is it that makes the Medieval History a greater book than the Modern? It *is* greater: we cannot conceive a denial. We had given the credit to the superb genius of its Chief Editor. And we are not yet convinced that we did mistake. For he is here in person still, and when not in person, in spirit. To set up a standard is half the accomplishment. What would the Tabernacle have been without the pattern showed in the Mount?

But the work was not only more grandly conceived; it has been, we think, more greatly executed. There is firmer individual footing; closer co-operation also; above all, there is an attainment to readableness throughout which the earlier work never reached. That must be the doing of the Editors. For let it be understood that an Editor can always secure grammatical English, and even good style, without sacrificing one jot of his contributors' originality.

This volume deals with Germany and the Western Empire. The authors are Professor Réné Poupardin, Professor Louis Halphen, Mr. C. W. Previté-Orton, Mr. Austin Lane Poole, Mr. Edwin H. Holthouse, Miss Caroline M. Ryley, Professor Allen Mawer, Mr. William John Corbett, Dr. Rafael Altamira, Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Dr. Montague Rhodes James, and Professor W. R. Lethaby.

To Sir Paul Vinogradoff has been entrusted that most difficult subject, Feudalism. We think we can detect advance in intelligibility beyond Maitland, advance also in esteem. 'The lord was a monarch in the manor, but a monarch fettered by a customary constitution and by contractual rights. He was often strong enough to break through these customs and agreements, to act in an arbitrary way, to indulge in cruelty and violence. But in the great majority of cases feelings and caprice gave way to reasonable considerations. A reasonable lord could not afford to disregard the standards of fairness and justice which were set up by immemorial custom, and a knowledge of the actual conditions of life. A mean line had to be struck between the claims of the rulers and the interests of the subjects, and along this mean line by-laws were framed and customs grew up which protected the tenantry even though it was forsaken by the king's judges. This unwritten constitution was safeguarded not only by the apprehension that its infringement might scatter the rustic population on whose labour the well-being of the lord and his retainers after all depended, but also by the necessity of keeping within bounds the power of the manorial staff of which the lord had to avail himself. This staff comprised the *stewards* and *seneschals* who had to act as overseers of the whole, to preside in the manorial courts, to keep accounts, to represent the lord on all occasions; the *reeves* who, though chosen by the villagers, acted as a kind of middlemen between them and the lord and had to take the lead in the organisation of all the rural services; the *beadles* and *radknights* or *radmen* who had to serve summonses and to carry orders; the various warders, such as the hayward, who had to superintend hedges, the woodward for pastures and wood, the sower and the thresher; the *graves* of moors and dykes, who had to look after canals, ditches and drainage; the *ploughmen and herdsmen*, employed for the use of the domanial plough-teams and herds. All these *ministri* had to be kept in check by a well-advised landlord, and one of the most efficient checks on them was provided by the formation of *manorial custom.* It was in the interest of the lord himself to strengthen the customary order which prevented grasping stewards and serjeants from ruining the peasantry by extortions and arbitrary rule. This led to the great *enrolments* of custom as to holdings and services, of which many have come down to us from the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; they were a safeguard for the interests both of the tenants and of the lord.'

But we need not quote. It is not by extracts that this work is to be judged. Let us note that one of the most useful as well as interesting of its chapters is the Introduction, by Professor J. P. Whitney. The maps are, as formerly, in a separate case.

FERRERO.

Signor Guglielmo Ferrero is the modern Gibbon. He has written a history in five volumes on the greatness and decline of Rome. He has style and he has scholarship. And he is courageous enough to write ancient history and make it a model for to-day. A recent book of his on *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity* has been translated by the Hon. Lady Whitehead (Putman; 12s. 6d.).

Signor Ferrero finds more than one cause for the fall of Rome, but he finds one cause more corrosive than all the rest. It is the fact that Rome could not make up its mind between an absolute monarchy and a free democracy. Trying to combine both methods of government it failed and fell.

Then comes the moral. 'The nations have not yet realized the political results produced by the World War, quite independent of the will and the plans of the men who seemed to guide its movements. Men still reason as if it were only the day after the Treaty of Utrecht. They have seen and still see only conquerors and vanquished, as if there had taken place a mere transfer of power and prestige from certain Powers to certain other Powers. They have not yet perceived that in the month of March, 1917, one of the two political principles on which rested the whole system of social order in Europe received its first formidable blow when the revolution in Russia broke out; that it received another blow, this time a decisive and mortal one, in the month of November, 1918, when the Empire of the Hapsburgs and that of the Hohenzollerns tottered and fell. They do not see that the overthrow of the monarchical system in Europe and the discrediting of the theory of rule by divine right, is an event of enormous importance; that it completes a political crisis begun two centuries ago; and that Europe is again in danger as in the third century of finding herself without any assured principle of authority.'

What, then, would Signor Ferrero have us do? That is just what he does not tell us. He shows us very clearly the danger of the division of authority between sovereign and people, but he shows us just as clearly the danger of resting authority either upon the will of the people alone, or upon the will of the ruler alone. He sees danger ahead whatever way he turns. He leaves the Powers to solve the problem of government in Europe after the upheaval of the War, for to him the problem seems insoluble.

THE SCOTTISH COMMUNION OFFICE.

The Scottish Communion Office, 1764, with Introduction, History of the Office, Notes and Appendices, by John Dowden, D.D., LL.D., sometime Bishop of Edinburgh. New edition, seen through the Press by H. A. Wilson (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 14s. net).

'The first edition of this work, published in 1884, has for a good many years been "out of print, and scarce." The author had been for some time making preparation for a new edition, and his work had been practically completed, when in 1908 the desire which he has expressed (see p. 98) for a renewed attempt at a revision of the Scottish Liturgy was fulfilled. It was natural that he should then have delayed any further steps towards publication till the question of revision should be settled; and its conclusion was not reached till nearly two years after his death.

'The need for a new edition of the book may be said to have become more apparent in the course of the discussions concerning the proposed revision: and arrangements were made for the publication of the late Bishop's work by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. The book was, as its author had left it, almost in readiness for printing: but some delay was necessary for the revision of Appendix C; and before the work of printing could be taken in hand, the war of 1914 had begun: it was still delayed by the war and its results when the editor to whose care the material had been committed was removed by death.

'Thus the book appears after repeated delays, and under less competent care than it would have had if it had been issued either in 1908 or in 1914.'

The only dissent from these words is in respect to the last sentence. No one could be, no one is or has been, more competent to edit and issue such a work as this than Mr. Wilson. Long ago he edited the Gelasian Sacramentary and sprang into the first rank of liturgical scholars. He has spent his life since then on the same study. This volume, so finely produced by the Oxford Press, is the last word of scholarship on the Scottish Communion Office.

The Abingdon Press of New York, enterprising in many ways, is especially so in the department of Education. The latest in their list of publications is an astonishing array of pamphlets, thirty-seven in number, from 24 to 64 pages each, and all offering instruction to the teacher of the infant school or to the parent in the home. The topics have a range which itself is something of an education. They run from so simple a subject as 'The Nation's Challenge to the Home' to so serious a subject as 'Thumb-sucking.' They include 'The Education of the Baby until it is One Year Old,' 'The Problems of Fighting,' 'The Dramatic Instinct in Children,' 'The Use of Dolls in Child-Training.'

For the earliest of introductions that treat of the New Psychology, by all means choose *The Machinery of the Mind*, by Violet M. Firth (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). It is a perfect triumph of simplicity and science.

We have just named an elementary introduction to the New Psychology. The book in which to follow up the study is *The New Psychology in its Relation to Life*, by Mr. A. G. Tansley (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). Published in June 1920, it reached its fifth edition in March 1922—a pretty conclusive proof of the interest in its subject and of the value of the book. The fifth edition has been revised and enlarged.

There is in the city of Boston, America, the Boston Vocation Bureau. It was started in 1908 by Professor Frank Parsons. Its business is not so much to find occupations for grown lads, as to train lads for their occupations. Professor Parsons believes not only that boys and girls should be educated, but that they should be educated from the very beginning for the particular work in life for which God has called them. And how do you know for what work God has called them? By their aptitudes. Terrible stories are told of boys who manifested an aptitude for electrical engineering, fitting up a whole installation in their homes before they were sent to a public school, and who were sent there to learn Latin and Greek. It is all worked out systematically, scientifically, in a book with the title of *The Find Yourself Idea*, published at the Association Press, New York ($1.40). The author is Mr. Clarence C. Robinson, Secretary for Employed Boys International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations.

Two excellent evangelical sermons by the Rev. William Kirk Bryce, of Bromley, Kent, have been published as a single pamphlet. The title is *What is True Christianity?* They are published by the author.

The Hon. Edward Lyttelton, M.A., D.D., D.C.L., late Headmaster of Eton, has written and published a volume of *Letters on Education* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 5s. net). We wish we could persuade every one of our own readers to read the volume. We have been most unusually moved by it ourselves. What is the theme? Well, it is the one and only theme, if we would be followers of the Lamb. For it is 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God,' and with such emphasis on *first* as arrests us there. There is no second. First the will of God and all else left alone. First touch with Him, and self dethroned. That is the aim of education. There is no other. But how tame and bare it is when set forth so. Read the book.

If there is not much for the advanced student of Dante in the three essays which have been published under the title of *Dante: Poet and Apostle* (Chicago: at the University Press; $1.25), there is enough for the beginner, and it is right well fitted to give the beginner an appetite. 'The Years of Preparation,' 'Dante as Apostle,' 'The Divine Comedy as Poetry'—those are the titles. The author is a well-trained Dante enthusiast, Ernest Hatch Wilkins, Ph.D., Litt.D., Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Chicago.

Messrs. Constable have reissued Mr. A. Clutton-Brock's *Studies in Christianity* (4s. 6d.).

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a volume of sermons on Prayer by Dr. Alexander Whyte. The title is *Lord, Teach us to Pray* (7s. 6d. net). It will be received as a gift from the dead, and with affectionate reverence. More appropriate gift could not have been given.

A wonderful power of appeal to the mind of the common people has Dr. J. Paterson-Smyth. He chooses the popular subject, he speaks the popular word on it. He does both unerringly every time. This time it is in a small book with the unerringly popular title of *On the Rim of the World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people,' said God to the ancient prophet. This is the modern prophet of comfort.

Few men have the ear of the intelligent student of Scripture more emphatically than Professor A. S. Peake. His latest volume is a collection of papers on *The Nature of Scripture* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), every one of them marked by the simplicity of utterance, clarity of thought, and profundity of scholarship which together have given Dr. Peake authority and eminence.

The last paper in the volume discusses the place of the Gospel in the preaching of to-day. 'I prefer,' says Professor Peake, 'to regard the Gospel as Christocentric rather than Staurocentric, if I may coin the term, understanding, of course, that any truly Christocentric theology will attach a very high significance to the Cross.' All the same, he considers that the Church was entitled to develop its theology on Christological lines, and not only entitled, but bound to do so. 'In making its theology Christocentric it obeyed an inevitable impulse which had been communicated to it by its experience of its Founder and was sanctioned by His teaching.'

With the modern demand, 'we must get to God,' he has no sympathy whatever, if it means that we may pass by Christ. 'It ought to be inconceivable that a Christian service should take place in which Christ should be excluded from the hymns sung by the congregation. From such services, when it has been my misfortune to attend them, I have gone away chilled. The great theistic hymns have their place in our worship: but the hymns which move us most profoundly are the hymns which are definitely Christian.'

Messrs. Macmillan have under issue Professor R. G. Moulton's *The Modern Reader's Bible for Schools*. It is an abridged edition of the well-known book. The Old Testament volume is ready (12s.).

It is thirty years since C. H. Spurgeon died, but his sermons seem to be living yet. Out of the unpublished manuscripts twenty sermons have been selected—twenty 'gospel' sermons, as they are superfluously called on the title-page—and have been published with the title of *Able to the Uttermost* (Marshall Brothers; 5s.). To some Spurgeon never appealed, but they were few. To the vast multitude his appeal, even on the printed page, was very strong. That strong appeal is present now as ever.

The best Life of Christ in existence is that which was written by the four Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The next best is that which adheres most closely to them. All imaginative working up is intolerable to those who are familiar with the Gospels themselves. In *The Story of the Passion* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net) the

Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, has not deviated one hair's-breadth from the original narratives. Hence the entire acceptability of his book. And what a persuasive story it is! How good to read, but also how good to move to right living! We hear all through the very words our Lord addressed to the lawyer: 'This do, and thou shalt live.' For here 'believe' and 'do' are interchangeable.

For many years Dr. A. E. Garvie has given himself to the Sunday-school teacher. And his original gifts of sympathy and discernment have been made more by experience. In *The Old Testament in the Sunday School* (Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net) he is supremely helpful. Not for the immediate daily need—give us this day our daily anecdote—does he write, but for the mind that will be ready at all times. Let the teacher 'get up' this book and a foundation is laid for all future daily portions to build upon.

After Miss Firth's little book, referred to previously, by all means choose *The Hidden Self and its Mental Processes*, by Mr. H. Ernest Hunt (Rider; 4s. 6d. net). One could begin with Mr. Hunt, but Miss Firth will break the ground a little. It is not a long book, but it is astonishing how much Mr. Hunt gets into it, and just as astonishing is it how clear he makes the most complicated matters. Even psycho-analysis becomes intelligible in his hands, and the difference between Freud and Jung quite manifest. More than all that, the book, though it deals so fully with matters of sex, is entirely unobjectionable, and not only unobjectionable but distinctly favourable to religion and morals. Mr. Hunt has a sense of responsibility both to God and to man. We commend this book unreservedly and most heartily.

The English Catalogue of Books for 1921 is out (Office of the Publishers' Circular). It contains the authors' names, titles, size, pages, and price of every book published in the United Kingdom that year, and every new edition, with the exact month of publication. The particular book wanted, if the author's name is forgotten, may be found under its own title. It is thus both an author and a subject index. If a man cannot attain immortality otherwise, he publishes a book. Does it not sell? Never mind; it is recorded in the English Catalogue, and that is immortality.

But, besides the double index, the Catalogue contains a list of learned Societies, two lists of Publishers (United Kingdom and United States), and an analysis of the books published throughout the year.

The analysis shows that 11,004 books were published in 1920, and 11,026 in 1921. Religion is up by nearly a hundred—679 in 1920, 775 in 1921. After fiction will any one guess the most popular subject?

What did Jesus mean when He said to Peter, first 'Feed my lambs,' and then 'Feed my sheep'? In particular, Who are the lambs?

Provost H. Erskine Hill does not think they are children. He will allow a possible and preliminary reference to infants and sucklings. 'But,' he says, 'it is only in a limited sense that the distinction which the Master draws between His "lambs" and His "sheep" can be so applied. His standard of maturity is not physical but spiritual, and spiritual development is measured by the capacity for self-sacrifice.

'In God's great human family there are some who are becoming more and more "fellow-workers" with Him. These correspond to the elder children moving on towards real companionship. But there are others who are spiritually undeveloped—His dearly-loved little ones, who need constant guidance and watchful care, the ignorant and the unintelligent, the savage and the hooligan. "Make allowance," He seems to say, "for their backwardness, make provision for their need. Feed My lambs."'

Provost Hill has written a devotional exposition of the last chapter of St. John's Gospel. The title is *The Master Teacher* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net).

It is no surprise to find Professor S. H. Hooke's book on *Christ and the Kingdom of God* already in a new edition (S.C.M.; 4s. net). For it is one of the two most creative books of its size within memory, the other being Hogg's 'Christ's Message of the Kingdom.' To the new edition there is prefixed a chapter on the Synoptic Problem, and there is affixed a note on the title 'Son of Man.'

In the interpretation of Jesus to modern men, even to modern young men, a distinguished place is likely to be taken by a book on *The Authority of Jesus*, written by the Rev. R. Winboult Harding, B.D. (S.C.M.; 5s.). The subject is clearly central and determining; the treatment is openhearted and adequate. In touch with the latest results of scholarship, not even neglecting the peculiarities of scholarship which can never yield results, Mr. Harding is at the same time quite conscious of the value of that Christian tradition of Christ handed down from generation to generation which has given Him His authority over men and marks Him to-day as the only force unquestionably making for righteousness throughout the world.

In describing the disposition of our Lord he does not find it necessary to draw very largely upon his imagination. He sees the danger of doing so as well as the needlessness of it. Careful study of what we are actually told in the Gospels of His early life is enough. He is just as much opposed to the notion that the idea of the Cross came upon Jesus as a complete surprise and only when He stood at the foot of it. In short, he is convinced that the humanizing of the history of our Lord has been carried much too far in some recent volumes, the popularity of which is no proof that they are not pernicious. The authority of Jesus is a greater fact than His gentleness, greater even than that idea of His goodness which some have been offering us as His supreme claim to our admiration, and which ought to be called 'goodiness' instead. His authority came certainly from His character, but His character included the power of raising the dead and casting out devils. Yes, and a greater power than that, the power of forgiving a sinner his sins.

The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, B.D., is Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. He is also a favourite lecturer in connexion with the Student Christian Movement. In response to an invitation from the committee of the Cambridge branch of that Movement he delivered a course of lectures in the Lent Term of 1922 at Cambridge, the subjects being chosen for him by the Secretary. These lectures are now published under the title of *Studies in Historical Christianity* (S.C.M.; 4s. net).

Two things are arresting. One, that Mr. Rawlinson is less of a modernist than was supposed. His first book seemed to leave Jesus at the Cross. This book carries Him to glory. There is no doubt that Christ is 'in some sense God.'

The other thing is that he is more of a sacramentalist than was realized. The first lecture is on Catholicism, the second on Episcopacy, the third on the Sacraments. The first and second lectures are noticeable only in that the Episcopacy advocated is, unexpectedly and no doubt unintentionally, Presbyterianism. In the third lecture he quotes that *enfant terrible* Professor Kirsopp Lake, and says: 'I think Professor Kirsopp Lake is right when he remarks that the controversial appeal of Protestant theologians in support of their views about sacraments to primitive Christianity has failed, and that "the Catholic doctrine is much more nearly primitive than the Protestant." When, however, he adds that "the Catholic advocate, in winning his case, has proved still more: the type of doctrine which he defends is not only primitive, but pre-Christian," the statement needs qualification.'

Now whatever is to be said about Dr. Lake's notion of the Protestant theologian, there is no doubt what must be said about his reference to the Catholic advocate. It is substantiated by Mr. Rawlinson himself, whose doctrine of the Sacraments is simply pagan animism.

The Rev. A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D., has published a volume of *Essays in Christian Thinking* (Swarthmore Press; 6s. 6d. net). His aim is not to throw a bundle of miscellaneous papers at our heads, but in a series of chapters to tell us what the truth is, as he conceives it, on the whole connected range of theology. 'Essays in Thinking' is a good title, for Dr. Cadoux is a thinker. And he has courage. The central thought of his book, the thought which determines all that goes before and all that follows after it, is the limitation of God. God cannot do what He would like to do—that is the explanation of all the evil and of all the attempts made to remove it, including the Cross of Christ. If you do not agree, Dr. Cadoux will not be dismayed. St. Paul does not agree, and yet he holds to his opinion. St. Paul 'shared with many of his age a belief in the unlimited nature of God's power with its corollary that man is morally predetermined, but where he brings this tenet into direct touch with man's moral life his argument is reversed by the figure he uses. "Hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Rom. ix. 21). Precisely, but only in so far as he has no one but himself to blame for the dishonour of the second lump. And since, in dealing with his own moral life, Paul never seeks to escape the burden of responsibility by an appeal to God's unlimited power, we must suppose that his doctrine of the latter belonged rather to the traditional theology of his day than to the experience by which he made a living contribution to Christian thought.'

Was Mark the Gardener of Gethsemane?

By Edmund D. Jones, M.A., Headmaster, County School, Barmouth, N. Wales.

Various conjectures have been made about the identity of the 'young man . . . having a linen cloth cast about him,' mentioned in Mk $14^{51.\,52}$. Some commentators base their conjectures on an attempt to answer the question, How came it about that this young man was present in his night attire? and accordingly they make one or other of the following suggestions: (*a*) that the young man was the owner of Gethsemane; (*b*) that he was Lazarus; (*c*) that he was a member of the family at whose house Jesus had eaten the Passover. Undoubtedly the first is the most natural suggestion, but they all fail to give an adequate explanation of the insertion of such a seemingly trivial incident in Mark's narrative. Other commentators have therefore approached the problem by endeavouring to answer the question, Why was this incident recorded by Mark? And they argue that only by assuming that the young man was Mark himself can a satisfactory reason be given for any mention of such an insignificant occurrence in such a tragic scene. And in confirmation of this is the fact that only Mark mentions it. It has also been pointed out[1] that the theory that the young man was Mark would explain how our Lord's prayer in His Agony came to be reported—it was Mark himself who heard it. But this theory still leaves unanswered the question—which the first-mentioned class of commentators attacked—How came it about that the young man was in the garden clothed in his sleeping garment? Until we have an answer to the *two* questions there can be no satisfactory solution of the problem. Now, it seems to me that the most natural explanation is that *Mark was the gardener of Gethsemane.* Indeed we may go even nearer to the first suggestion mentioned above, and say that he was the son of the owner—for it is generally held that the *sindon* was not worn by the lower classes, and we know (from Ac $12^{12\text{-}14}$) that Mark's mother, Mary, was a matron of some position. It is also a natural inference from the same passage that Mary was a friend of Jesus and His disciples. If Mary owned the garden we can understand how it was that 'Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples' (Jn 18^{2}).

Now I believe it is possible to adduce from the Gospel of Mark internal evidence to confirm my suggestion that he was a gardener. It will be found that he employs words and expressions that reveal an intimate knowledge of plant life and garden operations; and when we compare his language with that of parallel passages in the other Gospels we are at once struck by its greater exactness. The following points seem particularly noteworthy:

(i) In his account of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Mark says: 'digged *a pit* for the winepress' (12^{1})—ὑπολήνιον, a word used only here in the N.T. Matthew has merely the less accurate 'digged a winepress' (21^{33}).

(ii) In his account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mark uses the technical expression πρασιαί—'garden beds' (6^{40}), translated in R.V. 'in ranks.' This word again occurs only here in the N.T. Commentators generally suggest that this picturesque detail is to be attributed to 'the impressionable Peter.' Surely it is more likely to be an added touch of vividness by Mark—a term familiar to a gardener rather than to a fisherman!

(iii) In their account of the Parable of the

---

[1] In a paper read before the local Baptist Association at Barmouth by the Rev. J. Williams Hughes, B.A., B.D.

Mustard Seed, Matthew and Luke (Mt 13$^{31.\ 32}$, Lk 13$^{18.\ 19}$) describe the seed as 'becoming a tree' (δένδρον). As the mustard plant is only a herb—an *annual*—this expression is now allowed to be an 'exaggeration.' Mark does not employ this inaccurate expression, but uses instead the words 'putteth out great branches'—κλάδους μεγάλους—perhaps more correctly translated 'large twigs.'

Matthew and Luke again describe the birds of the heaven as 'lodging *in* the branches thereof.' Mark, on the other hand, says: 'can lodge *under the shadow* thereof'—a much more suitable expression for a herb. And Mark is careful not to say that birds do actually lodge under its shadow, but only that it is possible (δύνασθαι) for them to do so.

(iv) In the account of the Withering of the Fig-tree (11^{13}) only Mark makes the significant explanation, 'for it was not the season of figs.' And in describing the condition of the tree after it had withered, he alone adds, 'from the roots': as a gardener Mark knew that an accidental injury might have caused a partial withering, but here the life of the tree had entirely passed out of it.

(v) In his account of the Triumphal Entry (11$^{1-11}$) only Mark uses the technical term στιβάδας—'layers of leaves' (11^{8}). Matthew has only the ordinary word for 'twigs'—κλάδους.

It is also noteworthy that the four parables recorded by Mark all deal with the life of the garden and the fields. The parable peculiar to Mark—the Seed growing secretly—takes the place of the domestic parable of the Leaven, given in Matthew. And the exactness of the language of Mark in this parable is very striking—the seed 'sprouting and *lengthening*'; the three stages of growth—'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear'; and the fruit 'permitting' the husbandman to 'put forth the sickle.' It is hard to believe that Mark received from Peter the parable in this concise form where almost every word is charged with suggestive detail.

I believe that the cumulative effect of these citations goes far to prove that Mark's occupation was gardening, and to confirm the theory that I have propounded.

We may now try to reconstruct the scene in the Garden. When Jesus and His disciples went to Gethsemane, Mark was already there, passing the night, as the custom was, in the watch-tower. He did not know that Jesus would be coming there, and when he heard voices in the garden he immediately arose in his night garment to see what was taking place. And he came across Jesus, and overheard His words of anguish. It may be, indeed, that he even tried to console Him, and that his appearance in a white garment caused those of the disciples who had remained on the confines of the garden—farther away than Peter, James, and John (Mt 26^{36})—to imagine him to be an angel. (This would explain the origin of the interpolated verse about the angel in Lk 22^{43}.) When soon afterwards the crowd led by Judas entered the garden, Mark hastened to remonstrate with them for their intrusion, but they began to jeer at him and rough-handle him, so that he was fain to escape naked to the watch-tower.

The Raising of Lazarus.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Letchworth.

Is the narrative in the eleventh chapter of John a story of fact, or is it a piece of deliberate fiction? Quite obviously the author intended it to be taken as history, for in the next chapter 'Lazarus, whom he raised from the dead,' is introduced again, and in a very matter-of-fact way; and the miracle is represented as the chief cause of the temporary popularity of Jesus at Jerusalem, and of the determination of the chief priests to put Him to death (Jn 11^{46}–12^{19}). But those critics who conclude that the story is unbelievable have weighty arguments on their side.

1. In the first place, the modern conception of the miracles of Jesus (which in fact goes back at least to Augustine), that they were 'not contrary to nature, but only to what is known of nature,' seems to fail us altogether when it is a case of believing that a man was restored to life when so completely dead that his body had begun to decay. (It is true that this supposition of the anxious

Martha is not explicitly endorsed by the writer, but he seems to have reported it with the aim of bringing out to the utmost the astounding character of the miracle.) Belief in such an occurrence is only consistent with the doctrine which represents miracles as infractions of the ultimate laws of nature—a theory which I for one find myself quite unable to hold.

2. The most serious evidential objection to the reality of the occurrence is, of course, the silence of the Synoptists. Mark's omission of it might possibly be explained by the absence, at the time, of his informant, Peter (see Burkitt, *Gospel History*, pp. 96, 97); and the first Gospel was mainly dependent on Mark for its narrative of events. But the silence of Luke, who claims to have 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first,' and whose Gospel is now by most critics given a high place as history, is a graver difficulty. If the miracle really occurred, it would seem that Luke must have heard about it; and if it held the important place in determining the events that followed, which it has in the Fourth Gospel, he could hardly, as a careful historian, have omitted to mention it.

3. The raising of Lazarus does not stand alone, but may be regarded as an extreme instance of the tendency of the fourth evangelist to deal very freely with his material, whether this consists of events or discourses. Every careful student now agrees that his Gospel is not to be put side by side with the Synoptic narratives, but should be regarded as an *interpretation* of the person and teaching of Jesus rather than as a bare narrative: the happy phrase of Clement of Alexandria, 'a spiritual Gospel,' is felt to describe it accurately. The presence of a rather subtle and elaborate symbolism, underlying his choice of subjects and his method of dealing with them must be admitted; and symbolism is found here—the story must be read as illustrating the great saying, 'I am the resurrection and the life.' Further, the fact that he transfers to the beginning of our Lord's ministry the expulsion of the money-changers from the temple, which Mark and Luke represent as mainly determining the authorities 'to destroy him,' leaves a gap in the sequence of events. It is plausible to suggest that he has filled the gap by the invention of this resounding miracle.

On the other hand, the negative conclusion, to which many serious students feel themselves driven, is itself attended with grave difficulties. Chief among these, perhaps, are the realistic details which are by no means what we should expect were the author simply romancing. The realism of the story so impressed Ernest Renan that, rejecting as he did the possibility of miracles, he yet came to the grotesque conclusion that Lazarus really came from the tomb at the bidding of Jesus, but that it was a bogus miracle got up by the family at Bethany to further (as they thought) the purposes of Jesus—to which, in a moment of weakness, He lent Himself.[1]

As has been said above, we inevitably tend to classify a narrative such as this in the light of our impression of the whole book in which it occurs. And it is not easy to hold steadily, in view of all the facts, the impression that this book is one of pure romance. On some points of history, such as our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem, and the date of His crucifixion, it seems to give us real facts, the truth of which is testified to by fragmentary references in the Synoptics themselves, though contrary to the views they seem to have held. And the details which occur in many of the Johannine narratives, even after full allowance is made for the author's love of symbolism, are most simply and readily explained as due to some one's recollection—his own or that of his informant. Personally, I find it very difficult to believe that he would deliberately invent a story of such importance as that of the raising of Lazarus, and try to pass it off as fact. Of course, if that is the only conclusion to which the evidence leads us, we must accept it, whatever surrender of cherished convictions this involves, and however sorrowfully it may lower our sense of the religious value of the book and the spiritual sustenance it has brought us. But I do not think we are driven to this issue. In the Lazarus story, especially, it may be there is a middle path by which we may avoid the difficulties of either extreme. Perhaps it is based on something that did really occur, but which the author has characteristically idealized—telling it in his own way, to make it yield thoughts about Jesus and His work which he believed were true. The objection that this does not get over the omission of the story by the Synoptists is not perhaps fatal. The silence of Mark (and also of Luke, supposing an early date for his Gospel can be accepted, say during the sixties or seventies of the first century) may possibly be due in part to the reluctance of the Bethany family to be brought into public notice during their lifetime.

---

[1] *Life of Jesus* (English translation, 1863), pp. 250, 251. 'Tired of the cold reception which the Kingdom of God found in the capital, the friends of Jesus wished for a great miracle which should strike powerfully the incredulity of the Hierosolymites. The resurrection of a man known at Jerusalem appeared to them most likely to carry conviction. . . . We must remember that in this dull and impure city of Jerusalem, Jesus was no longer himself. Not by any fault of his own, but by that of others, his conscience had lost something of its original purity. Desperate, and driven to extremity, he was no longer his own master. His mission overwhelmed him, and he yielded to the torrent,' etc.

If we take the story as it stands, we see that it is so reported as to give the impression that Jesus knew from the first moment when He received the news of the sickness of Lazarus that He would raise him from the dead, and so would manifest the 'glory' of His Father (Jn 11^{4}). But incidents are recorded which, if we read carefully between the lines, seem capable of a different and certainly more natural explanation. Jesus began by telling the disciples that 'this sickness is not unto death'—by which, surely, He may have meant exactly what He said, that He thought it would not prove fatal. He remained 'two days in the place where he was'; then, having apparently received an inward intimation that the illness had after all ended in death, He proposed, fully knowing the risk, to go at once into Judea. The reason given for this shows almost certainly that the explanation of His delay is that He had not been sure what the Divine will was. 'If a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because the light is not in him.' He then told His disciples what He had inwardly discerned—breaking the death gently to them under the figure of sleep, and afterwards stating it in plain terms.

When He reached the neighbourhood of Bethany the information came that Lazarus had died four days before. There is evidence, I understand, of a notion among the Jews that the departed soul lingered near the body for four days; so that if He had thought it might be God's will that He should restore His friend to life, He may now have feared that it was too late to do so. The behaviour of the two bereaved sisters is strikingly consistent with their characters as depicted in the brief passage Lk 10^{38-42}, but, so far as I can see, there is no trace of borrowing. The restless Martha jumped up at once to go to Jesus, while Mary the dreamer 'still sat in the house.' The conversation of Jesus with Martha appears to be idealized so as to bring out with the greatest force the statement 'I am the resurrection and the life,' and to suggest that belief in Jesus as the Son of God is the great essential. Then Martha returned to her sister with the news that Jesus wanted her. It was from her that He had received special sympathy and understanding, and He needed now again to receive as well as to give it. Why did He remain at that distance from the place, instead of going at once to Mary? No cause for the further delay is suggested; but if His path had been obscure before, is it not reasonable to suppose that the information about the date of the death had brought back His doubts? This, it seems to me, is the only adequate explanation of the terrible agitation that followed. Jesus *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*. He shook all over, and groaned inwardly (the word by its derivation suggests snorting like an excited horse), and finally broke down in sobs. The evangelist puts this down to sympathy with the sorrow of Mary and her friends; but if he correctly represents Jesus as fully knowing that He would shortly raise Lazarus to life, what need was there for such intense sympathy? Another explanation [1] is that He was indignant at their unbelief (the word *ἐμβριμάομαι* expresses indignation in Mk 14^{5} and elsewhere), but this appears equally unsatisfactory. Surely He would not be angry with them for not expecting such a miracle as the raising to life of one who had been dead four days!

Neither of the extreme views of the narrative—first that it is all fact, and second that it is all fiction—gives any acceptable explanation of the almost unbearable stress and strain through which the soul of Jesus is represented as passing. On the first view there was no need for it; on the second it is about the last thing that a romance writer would have invented. He would surely have made Jesus thoroughly master of the situation—perfectly calm and self-possessed. What the writer has done, it seems to me, is to record facts without having rightly understood their meaning.[1] The real explanation, I venture to suggest, is that Jesus was seeking with the most intense earnestness to know His Father's will, which had not yet been fully revealed to Him. To go forward 'in the night' would be not only to 'stumble,' it would be to 'tempt the Lord thy God'; and to fail in the effort would bring utter disaster and final ruin on all He had lived for.

---

[1] See article 'Notes on Jn 11,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Dec. 1920, by Rev. A. Henderson, D.D. (pp. 123 ff.). The writer sees (correctly, as I think) that Jesus delayed to go to Bethany because 'He was waiting for light,' but he does not carry the suggestion through.

The agitation of Jesus is represented as continuing until He reached the tomb. Then, the stone having been removed at His bidding, in spite of Martha's anxious protest, He '*lifted up his eyes*, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me.' In answer to His agonizing prayer, the light had come to Him at last, and He saw clearly what He was to do. He called Lazarus from the tomb, and Lazarus came.

I think this story must be based on fact, because of the uninventible details it contains; and, with such reading between the lines as is here suggested, it seems possible to understand (more or less) what happened.[2] I do not myself suppose that Martha's fears about the opening of the tomb were justified. I do not take it that Lazarus was so completely 'dead' as to be beyond the possibility of resuscitation if the right methods could have been employed. There are death-like trances which may last for many days; and I imagine the few cases in which Jesus is reported to have raised the dead to life were of this character. The patients were probably beyond the power of any medical skill or methods available in those days, and would, I suppose, soon have succumbed completely if Jesus had not intervened with a supernormal control of matter by spirit. These 'miracles' I take to have been simply an extension to persons apparently dead of His ordinary works of healing, and to have been wrought in the same way. The fewness of the reported cases suggests that He never attempted to restore the dead indiscriminately, and only did so when He had an inward intimation that it was the Divine will for Him to act.

The most satisfying view of the Fourth Gospel as a whole appears to be that its records are based on fact, but that the facts are idealized and interpreted in accordance with the deep spiritual purpose of the writer. Used with care, the religious purpose being always kept in mind, its records may be found to supplement and even usefully to correct the Synoptic account. It has often been pointed out, for instance, that there is a hiatus in the Synoptic story of the events leading up to the crucifixion: nothing is recorded by Mark which adequately accounts for the enthusiasm of the people at the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11[8-10]). Such a mighty work as the raising of Lazarus, even if somewhat less 'mighty' than the fourth evangelist has made it appear, seems to fill the gap.

---

[1] Other instances of apparent misunderstanding of things recorded are in Jn 2[21], 'He spake of the temple of his body,' and 12[33], 'this he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die.' The presence of these apparent misapprehensions tells strongly against the romance theory of the book.

[2] For a similar view of the problem see *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel,' by A. E. Brooke, esp. pp. 312–316.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Upside Down.

'These that have turned the world upside down.'—Ac 17[6].

The other month Mr. Horace Hutchinson, who writes about all kinds of interesting things like golf and fishing, told a story of a magpie. It seems he has a brother who is fond of gardening: and one day he was planting out his geraniums, if I remember it aright—a whole heap of them, bed on bed. It's tiring work, and no doubt he grew hot and stiff: but at last it was finished, and he rose up and straightened his sore cramped back, and looked at his work with pride and went indoors. A magpie had been watching, and now it hopped forward and looked at the neat beds, thought, evidently, there was something wrong, took each geranium and with a sharp tug pulled it out, planted it upside down, with its roots in the air and its leaves in the hole; and then, sitting with its head on one side, looked again at this new rearrangement of it all, as if it were saying to itself, 'Ah! now that's a good deal better!'

Yet it's usually a mistake to turn things upside down. The plants were really better when the other way. Nearly always it's a great mistake. The other day when you went into the sitting-room it was, most of us thought, quite neat and nice. But you and your brothers hadn't been there five minutes when it looked very different. The table-cloth was on the floor, the cushions were anywhere except upon the chairs, the chair backs (isn't that the proper name for them? you know the things with sewing that get all rumply whenever you sit down), well, you had rolled them into crumpled balls. It was rather a different room from what you found. You may have thought it nicer. Certainly it was all upside down. But when mother came in she just stood in the door and glared with a look that meant she would like to turn you upside down, and give you a good spanking. Ah! but that's a mistake too, usually, that kind of turning upside down. It nearly always is. Or the proper way is lessons first, and then games. You must get out in daylight of course. But, on the whole, and after that, lessons first, then games.

That's the right side up, and the other way is a mistake. You get interested in the cricket or the football and forget how time is flying; stay out far longer than you meant. 'Is it really?' you say to the boy with the watch, 'and I promised to be home an hour and a half ago,' and off you sprint. But you're hot and sticky and uncomfy: must have a wash up, and that takes time; and change your collar, and your stud tumbles down your back and you have half to undress to get it, and that takes more time: and in the end you have to scamper through your lessons just to be able to say you did learn them. But there's trouble next day at school. The geraniums really were better the right end up. It should be lessons on Friday night and then the whole week-end to yourself. Make it the other way and it spoils things, knowing you always have them there still to be done, and you're so apt to forget about them far too long.

All decent boys and girls ought to get sleepy about half-past seven or eight, and waken about half-past seven eager for anything, with no sleep in their eyes or heads. But turn it upside down, coax and wheedle mother to let you sit on. It seems fine—but next morning they waken you before you seem to have slept at all: and all the buttons are too big for the button-holes, and you get cross, and the quicker you try to be, the slower you become. You're late for breakfast, there's trouble over that; and late for school, trouble again; and your books were just here; 'Mother, where are they?' and when all the house has searched you remember you put them elsewhere. And you know you left your cap upon this peg; 'Mother, where is it?' And by and by it's found behind the door where you kicked it when you were playing footer with it. And it's all horrid and upset, just because you turned things upside down. Sleepy at 7.30, and awake at 7.30 in the morning: that's the right way of it. It's seldom wise to turn things upside down.

But there are some things that must be turned upside down. The world, for instance. Paul looked out at it and saw that every one was thinking of fame and riches and little of kindness and unselfishness. That's wrong way up, he thought; we must transpose it, make it think first of kindness and unselfishness and little of fame and riches. There was once a Wesleyan preacher whose sermon had three parts: (1) The world is wrong side up; (2) the world must be put right side up; (3) we are the men to do it. So thought Paul, and set about it

And there's another thing, and that's your life. It's wrong end up. You think first of yourself and only then of other people. It ought to be the other way. If only one can go, you want to go. That's living upside down, like the geranium with its roots in the air. You ought to think first about other folk, what the wee ones would like, not always what yourself would like; what mother would want you to do, not always just what you would choose. Turn it right round and upside down and it will be far better. I think the magpie had a good idea, though it didn't work it out too cleverly or at a proper time. It's usually a mistake to turn things upside down, but sometimes you must do it.

Light.

'For thou wilt light my candle' (R.V. 'lamp').—Ps 18[28].

There is a wonderful meaning in a little light, dear children, if we look at it not only with our eyes but with our minds open. It does not matter what it is. It may be of oil, or of wax, or gas, or electricity; it may be a torch, or a lamp, or a candle, or just a little taper. That does not matter. All depends upon how we look at it.

What does light stand for in the Bible?

1. It stands for rejoicing; you recollect what

happened when Haman's plans for crushing the Jews were overthrown, and Mordecai and Esther saved their people from destruction, how they celebrated their deliverance? The Jews, says the Bible, had light, and joy, and gladness, and honour. Light and gladness always go together among us. And you recall, of course, what we do after some great victory, or on Coronation Day, or the King's Birthday. There is always a grand illumination after dark, and all the chief streets and buildings, and many of the little ones too, blaze out in light; for light means rejoicing.

2. Then, again, light stands for welcome. If you have a friend or relation coming to see you, you light up an extra candle or two or an extra jet of gas, to show that you are glad to have them with you again. It is more cheery and encouraging; one feels that instinctively.

I have read of a poor old widow whose son once left his home in a fit of anger and ill-temper. But the mother, who had already forgiven him—as is the way of mothers—before he had well crossed the threshold, but who never knew where he had gone to, always expected him back again. Not knowing whether it might not be night when he returned, always before she went to sleep o' nights she put a lighted lamp in the window, so that should he perchance return in the dark he might know the old cottage again, and read in that steadily burning light that threw its rays out into the dark night a sign that he was welcome and expected.

Do you remember what Christina Rossetti makes the Prodigal Son say?—

Does that lamp still burn in my father's house
  Which he kindled the night I came away?
I turned once beneath the cedar boughs
  And marked it gleam with a golden ray—
Did he think to light me home some day?

3. And then, again, light stands for guidance and caution. All round our coast, and especially in the more dangerous parts, there are beacons dotted about; and each has its own way of signalling, which the mariners understand, and as the ships pass to and fro in the dark, the seamen can tell exactly where they are, and keep far away, especially in stormy weather, from the rocks or sandbanks on which otherwise they might founder. Those lights never fail to warn them and to direct them aright, and the same thing of course applies to railway signals.

4. And once more, light stands for hope and promise. When Columbus set out on his voyage to discover a new world, in which he believed, though neither he nor any man in Europe had ever seen it, he had to pass through a terrible time of discouragement. He had been beating about for many weeks upon the Atlantic; and his crew were getting mutinous, and they wanted to force him to return. He was thinking of the jeers and jests with which he would be received if he came back with his task unfinished. Then one night as he was peering over the bows of the vessel he saw what appeared to him a tiny speck of light; his heart beat high, he could hardly trust his eyes. He called his companions to give their opinion, and they too thought they saw the light. And though it soon disappeared the brave mariner kept on his course through the unknown seas, and when morning broke they found they were really drawing near to land. That light—perhaps from some humble fisherman's hut—was the first gleam of the New World. To it, and the promise it gave and the hope it kindled, we owe, in a certain sense, the discovery of America—a discovery that has done more than anything else during the last 400 years for the progress of the whole human race. So the light is what is called a symbol of hope and promise.

5. Light also stands for safety. In olden times when the street had no lamps, and of course no electric light, people who were out at night carried lanterns with them to secure them against attacks. When they had lights they felt safe. Some little children, however, are very foolish to be afraid of the dark. Their mothers and fathers are watching over them, they never need be afraid. Mother and father go to sleep too. But then there is God. He is always awake; He never sleeps. He puts His watch-lights in the sky, the moon and stars, just as by day He sends the sunshine. Why, the sun is always shining somewhere! Sometimes here, sometimes in Australia, but it never goes out. So all the world is safe, because there is light everywhere.

Can you quote Whittier's lines?—

A tender child of summers three,
  Seeking her little bed at night,
Paused on the dark stair timidly:
'O, Mother, take my hand,' said she,
  'And then the dark will all be light.'

We older children, grope our way
From dark behind to dark before;
And only when our hand we lay,
Dear Lord, in Thine, the night is day,
And there is darkness nevermore.

6. And light is a symbol of something more. Those of you who have learned English history, and have got as far as the reign of Queen Mary, will remember how people were in those days burnt because there was some little difference between their religious belief and that of those who held power for the time being. Of course, nowadays, we should be ashamed to hurt other people because they don't believe as we do. But it was different then. Now when two good men, Bishops Latimer and Ridley, were led to the stake at Oxford, Latimer greeted the other with the words: 'Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as (I trust) shall never be put out.' So the light stands as a memorial of martyrs, of good and great men who gave up their lives for what they believed true, and thus have left to succeeding ages the bright light of their noble example that will never, never be extinguished.

The Christian Year.

Trinity Sunday.

God's Anxiety.

'Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you.'—1 P 5[7].

These words of the Apostle are very familiar to all of us. They are often quoted by us to our friends, and we do so with the hope that they will be of comfort and strength to them. Yet again and again when they occur to us in our own necessities they do not seem to have the same effect upon us that we hope they have upon others. Part of the reason no doubt lies in the fact that as we have them before us, they do not suggest just the same close and intimate meaning which the writer intended, and this result is due to a certain imperfection or limitation in the translation. It may be that when the translation was made the English words had a somewhat different meaning for the minds of the readers from what they have now, but if we follow the Greek closely and give the corresponding meaning which the words now would have they undoubtedly gain in strength and have a stronger appeal in them. If we were to read them somewhat as follows we would see the difference. 'Throwing all your anxieties upon Him; for He is anxious about you' *or* 'for you.'

We do not think of God in this way. We never think of Him as having that deep, personal and individual interest in our lives which is put before us when we think of those closest to us as worrying about us, or having us on their minds, or being anxious for us because they see we are troubled and distressed either in mind or in body. Yet this is just what the writer had in mind, and this is the way he thought of God and why there is that sense of intimate and real affection and concern in His mind for His children who have so many troubles and disappointments, anxieties and worries which wear down the strength and take away the swift and glad consciousness of the greatness of living.

In Luther's *Table Talk*, a book which tells us more of the inner spirit of a man than any other book which was ever written, he says: 'I expect more goodness from Kate my wife, from Philip Melanchthon, and from other friends than from my sweet and blessed Saviour Christ Jesus; and yet I know for certain, that neither she nor any other person on earth, will or can suffer that for me which He has suffered; why then should I be afraid of Him? This, my foolish weakness, grieves me very much.' It is not often we hear any one speak so frankly, and yet he tells only what perhaps most of us are as sure of as he. Our words do not have behind them that actuality which comes from a deep and personal experience or consciousness. So it is also with God.

1. Most of us do not think of God in this tender, familiar way that Peter did. We never think of Him as worrying about us or caring really enough to worry about us. To us He is something mysterious, awful, unimaginable, and remote. There is nothing *near* about Him; that is, near in a personal and spiritual sense. We think of Him as a great, living, energizing power which overshadows and overwhelms the whole of life. He is behind and before, but He is not after all near to us in the same way even that Jesus Christ is. He, we feel quite sure, was deeply familiar with the actual experiences, the poor human foibles and weaknesses, the sins and failures, the disappointments and despairs, the hard trials and the silent sorrows,

all the vast, minute and ever-changing and ever-shifting thoughts, hopes, dreams and sadness of this strange and complex life of ours. He is not only familiar with it, we are sure, but we have also a pathetic feeling and hope that He cares and sympathizes with us in so far as the actual knowledge of the actual facts of life is concerned. This is what has kept Him always through all the ages the one single person to whom all the plain, simple, silent people of the world have turned with such a sure confidence in His affection. But it has not, for the most of us at least, been at all this way with God. We are puzzled and weary with the search for what He really is and how He really feels.

2. Now if one really felt that God cared just as much as Jesus Christ, and cared in just the same personal, minute way, how utterly different it would be. It would make a difference in so many strange ways that it would be quite impossible to tell them all, but it is easy to see how great the change would be. If it was really true to us we would feel that God was worrying about us at all times when we were not just what He wanted us to be. If we were hard and brutal and selfish and mean, and what we call cantankerous, not even in any way speaking of the things people call sins, but just those common facts which make life hard and human nature not fine and interesting or true; if we thought that this all really distressed Him as we are sure it must have always distressed Jesus when He saw the insincerity, the brutality, the wretched and gross selfishness, then it does make a difference. No one in the best part of his soul really wants to pain or distress his friends. Many people for the sake of others have suffered a good deal of self-denial. This because one feels that it would worry and distress them. Now, if one really felt that God cared in just this way one might go with a quite different feeling and tell Him all these things, make a clean breast of it, put the matter before Him just as one feels sure one would put the matter, whatever it was, before Jesus Christ. And in doing so one might be quite certain that it would meet with His soothing and sympathetic interest.

If you have a son or daughter and you see that they are keeping something from you, though you feel reasonably sure that you know, you have a feeling something akin to what we are told here God feels toward us. He cares, really cares, is anxious about us, worries about us, if you want to use the word, and does so because most of all He sees that we are not quite sure of Him, perhaps, as again and again it happens, are not sure of Him at all. There is a wide dreary space between the soul of the child and the soul of the parent and nothing can bridge it or seems able to do so. Of course all this is quite childish. It does not in the least agree with the common notions which we have got together from our reading and study or experience. There is nothing scientific or philosophical about it. These both teach some wonderful, some deep and splendid things about what God has done and how vast and mysterious His creation is, but they do not say after all any of the things which Jesus Christ says, nor do most of them resemble Jesus Christ any more than the rest of us do. And the God about which they tell us is not the same, or at least it is not the same side which Jesus so wonderfully speaks of. There is none of that gracious yearning tenderness. There is none of that immediate feeling of a Father quite near and always waiting and wanting a fuller and closer relation with His children. Now this was the God Luther found through Jesus Christ, and this was the God that lifted him up and made him the mighty man that changed the world or helped to change it. He was so sure that God cared, that He looked at and after each of His children, that he was quite prepared to leave everything to Him. If things went wrong, if men were brutal and selfish and did shocking things he was deeply stirred, but he knew somehow and sometime men would learn how much they could trust Him and how great the need is always that they should trust Him.[1]

First Sunday after Trinity.

Faith in Jesus Christ.

'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'—Ac 16³¹.

Faith is the constant experience of the life of God in the soul, a sense of relationship with the eternal. It is the conviction that God is, that He is with us, that He is with us to lead and help and heal. The God in whom we believe is the God we see in Jesus Christ; therefore faith is belief in Jesus Christ. Faith, then, is an experience. It is the misfortune of Christian history that this has not always been emphasized. A few choice spirits in the early Christian days lived in union with God and attempted to report their experience. The generations that followed took that report, formulated it into a system of belief, and substituted the statement for the experience itself. Then Christianity gradually became a body out of which the life had gone. Yet down across the centuries comes the first apostles' testimony. 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'

---

[1] S. Means, *Parish Sermons*.

1. This faith saves from the limitations of finitude. Thereby the range of life is increased both extensively and intensively. Man is no longer shut in by the boundaries of time. He is a sharer of the life of the eternal. Death cannot harm him. He has that within him that transcends the power of change and death. Not only so, but through faith he finds a vocation that gives to his life a meaning and worth that are inestimable. Henceforth the goal of endeavour is that he shall measure toward the standard of Him in whom God dwelt complete. Character, as Jesus realized it, becomes a value to be sought after supremely. 'What shall it profit a man, if he gain the world, and lose his soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?'

And here we come upon the second term of Jesus' gospel. Life is so constituted that no one can win his soul alone. Man, as a child of God, is the member of a family, and wins the opportunity to a larger life in the service of his fellows. 'He that loseth his life shall save it.' Union with God is fellowship in work. Each shares with all in the divine purpose of creating a kingdom of individuals who will be partners in a life permeated and controlled by the divine will. The ministry of Jesus was the inauguration of that kingdom; it was also the evidence that ages of labour and sacrifice would be necessary for its consummation. To win the kingdom Jesus must die; to become one with Him in the life of God His followers become sharers with Him in a process of redemption realized through the ministry of the Cross.

2. This faith saves from the hurts and ills of time. It has been said that the unchristian conduct of society to-day does not instance the failure of Christianity, for no serious attempt has yet been made to apply the principles of Jesus to social relations. This same claim might be made regarding one aspect at least of the life of the individual. The mass of men and women are weighed down and their happiness marred by fear and anxiety, prompted largely by ills of their own making. This should not be. Life in God is greater than all these things and need not fear because of them. Fear is the great enemy of man, and fear is only another name for lack of faith. Jesus often wept in the presence of anxiety and heartache, but His tears were tears of sympathy for the failure of faith. It was so difficult for His followers to learn the lesson He came to teach, that they could rise above life's ills. To His disciples He said: 'Have faith in God . . . If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.'

We have poorly learned this lesson too. The haggard aspects of life—its pain, sorrow, misfortune, and disease—fill our souls with fear, when all that is needed is the venture of faith to prove that life is friendly and essentially trustworthy. Trust in God, with a clear sense of his aim for life, banishes fear as the morning sun scatters the dark. Who can separate us from the love of God? Can tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or trial, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, for through them the real treasures of life are won. He that has found God has found a source of contentment; there is no fear for him who realizes that the eternal God is our refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.

3. This faith saves from the guilt and power of sin. Sin is primarily separation from God. It is indifference to and rebellion against the will of God. It is following the momentary peculiar interest, as opposed to the appeal of a larger good. To be saved from sin a man must be drawn away from obedience to narrow self-interest into devotion to the law of the larger life. He becomes ready to sacrifice present impulse to reason, the gratification of the moment to future realization, individual gain to the welfare of the common life. Faith accomplishes this change. As the act of coming into conscious union with God, faith begins a process of transformation in character that is destined to terminate in righteousness. The will is the spring of action. When the will becomes right it tends to righten the whole life.

Sin may have wrought permanent physical injury, but a change of will has in it the promise of rebirth in character. Not only so, but the life of God in the soul makes available to man the resources of the Infinite. The will of man is energized and made capable of an attainment otherwise impossible. Jesus stated this fact under the allegory of the vine and the branches. 'Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.' Jesus is the world's Redeemer, for it is through Him that man is drawn away from his sin into union with the eternal. He has taught man to hate sin. He banished the cloud of guilt from the human soul when He said, 'It is not the will of your Father . . . that one of these little ones should perish.' He struck new courage into man's heart when He declared that God is ever labouring and suffering for His wayward children's sake. Through faith in Him souls have gone from darkness to light, from the power of sin and death to the power of the Spirit and life. Dead unto sin, they have become alive unto God through Jesus Christ.

I may not be able to satisfy my understanding concerning the marvels recorded in the Gospels about Jesus, but this I know when I come into His presence I see one who has made God known to me; I see one who reveals to me what a man ought to be; I learn that my life may be lived in union with the Eternal, and that when thus lived it wins a power that enables it to rise above trouble, sorrow, death, and sin. This is enough. I bow before Him and lift up my prayer that He will give me faith to follow Him and grace to become day by day more like Him.[1]

Second Sunday after Trinity.

The Vine.

'I am the true vine.'—Jn 15^1.

As He approached that Valley of Death which each one of us must at last pass through alone, Jesus had a great desire for one hour of quiet companionship with His friends. From one of His secret followers in Jerusalem He borrowed an upper chamber that He and His disciples might, as a family, take their last meal together undisturbed. He made one final effort to recover Judas Iscariot from his crime, but in vain, and, unable longer to endure the traitor's presence, bade him go and fulfil his design. Then with characteristic self-devotion He set Himself to prepare His disciples for the tragedy of the morrow. He told them that He was about to die, and used His unfailing courage to impart courage to them. You will leave Me, He said, to face this hour alone; yet I shall not be alone, for the Father will be with Me. I shall seem to leave you alone; yet you will not be alone, for the Father will give you the strength-giving Spirit He has given to Me, and that Spirit will abide with you for ever. You will not see Him, but you will know Him, because He will be in you as He has been in Me. You will think Me dead, but I shall not be dead. I will come to you, and you will share My imperishable life with Me. And My Father will come, and we will dwell with you and bring peace to you. And then He gives in a simple and to them familiar figure His interpretation of the Israel of the future, borrowing the figure from the Hebrew Psalmists, one of whom had, in the Exile, sung of the vine which Jehovah had planted:

Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt:
Thou didst drive out the nations, and plantedst it.

To this cry of the seemingly deserted Israel, Isaiah's use of the same figure furnishes a reply: 'Let me sing for my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard.'

In the days preceding the Last Supper, Jesus had recalled to the multitudes in the temple this ancient figure and had compelled from the people their condemnation of the rulers of Israel: 'The Lord of the Vineyard,' they had said, 'will destroy those wicked men and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen who will render him the fruits in their season.' And Jesus had commended their verdict: 'The kingdom of God,' He said, 'shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' Now, speaking to His disciples to revive their hopes and inspire their courage, He recalled to their minds the familiar Parable of the Vineyard, and gave to it a prophetic interpretation.

This is the fullest description which Jesus has left to the world of His ideal for that Brotherhood to which He has committed the completion of His commission. The members have organized themselves into different worshipping congregations separated by the variety of their theological opinions, expressed in creeds, and the variety of their tastes and temperaments expressed in rituals. These Christian organizations are sometimes treated in religious writing as though they were one and are called the Church, or the Holy Catholic Church; but the Christian Brotherhood out of which they have all grown is more than the Church or all the Churches combined. It is founded not on agreement in opinion, that is, on a creed; not on agreement in forms of worship, that is, on a ritual; not on agreement in the form of organization, that is, neither on a hereditary priesthood nor on a democratic congregation, nor even on love for a sacred but long since buried Messiah: but on love and loyalty to a living Messiah, for ever incarnate in the hearts and lives of His disciples, in a more intimate companionship and with a far wider and mightier influence than when He trod the earth with the few score of faithful friends whom He gathered about him.

---

[1] H. B. Williams, *Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought*.

This prophetic parable, giving Christ's interpretation of what the Christian Brotherhood should be, interprets and is interpreted by the history of the Christianity. The little seed has become a great tree. The little band of twelve has grown to such proportion that it is counted by millions. The Brotherhood that had no purse nor scrip, nor even so much as two changes of raiment apiece when they went forth on their travels, is now endowed with a wonderful equipment. There are no edifices in the world more splendid than some of the edifices which this Brotherhood has constructed. There are no schools of learning better than those which this Brotherhood has endowed. It has spread over the globe, so that to-day there is scarcely any language in which the praise of their Leader is not sung; scarcely any community in which His word is not proclaimed; scarcely any spot where men do not gather to honour His name, and to strengthen themselves the better to do His service. The influence from this band overruns its boundaries. Belief in the Leader, belief in a good God who rules the world, is no longer confined to the professed successors of these twelve. It is difficult to tell who are within the Brotherhood and who are without it, because the faith of the Christian Church has become the faith of the Christian community, and the principles of the Christian Church are, in some measure at least, accepted by those who do not profess to belong to it.

It is true that the prosperity and progress of the Church has been its peril. While it has been pushing its influence out into the world, the world has been pushing its influence into the Church. Deeds of avarice and cruelty have been strangely interwoven in the fabric of its history with deeds of unselfish devotion and self-sacrificing love. It has been both narrow-minded and large-hearted; both divided into petty sects quarrelling over forms of words and united in world-wide service by love for its Master. Whenever it has lost that love; whenever it has substituted an admiration of beauty for a reverence of goodness, emotional enjoyment for self-denying service, regulation of conduct for inspiration of the spirit, belief in a creed for faith in a Person, whatever its wealth, its political power, its prestige, whatever the beauty of its services, the regularity of its order, or the soundness of its theology, it has ceased to be a living Church, and has had pronounced against it the condemnation uttered nineteen centuries ago against its prototype: 'Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.'

Nevertheless, no organization has been so enduring, so world-wide in its influence, so beneficent in its service, so deathless in its vitality as the Christian Church. And wherever it has gone it has sown the seeds out of which have grown hospitals for the sick, asylums for the poor, schools for the ignorant, liberty supplanting despotism, a reverence of love supplanting the reverence of fear, and, growing clearer with the passing of time, divine ideals of courage, chivalry, charity, and brotherhood unknown before. It has been attacked by ruthless persecution from without, and by feuds and factions not less ruthless from within. Again and again its usefulness has seemed to come to an end, and it has seemed to die a death from which there could be no resurrection; again and again it has been entombed, the rock door of its tomb has been sealed and its enemies have declared its power ended; and again and again it has risen from the dead, cast off its grave clothes, and entered upon a new life.

In the first century Nero thought that he had killed the infant child, and three centuries later the successor of Nero proclaimed Rome a Christian empire. In the Middle Ages the Christian Church had adopted not only the outer form but the persecuting spirit of pagan Rome, and the splendid cathedrals became its tomb and the jewelled robes of its priests became its grave clothes; yet all the while its deathless life inspired the Preaching Friars laying in England the foundations of England's future liberty, and the self-denying sisters of mercy and charity precursors of the Red Cross of the then distant future. In the eighteenth century the Protestant Church seemed dead in England. The cross was on the spires of the cathedral but not in the lives of the clergy; the preaching was an ethic as uninspiring as that of Confucius; the religion of Dean Swift was no more Christian than the infidelity of Bolingbroke; the most famous moral teacher of his time, Archdeacon Paley, defined virtue as 'doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God and for the sake of everlasting happiness.' And yet out of this decadent Church issued the enthusiasm of Wesleyanism in England and of Moravianism on the Continent. The nineteenth century saw dogmatism within the Church, and agnosticism without unconsciously joining their forces to destroy the Church which was the only confessed defender of the truth and of the vitality of spiritual experience, and the century was called by friend and foe alike the 'age of scepticism.' And yet it is in this age of scepticism that the Christian Church has given birth to the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and the Red Cross, and their work has furnished the most luminous illustration the world has ever seen of the spirit of Him who laid down His life for us that we might lay down our lives for the brethren.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Ownership.

'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'—Ps 24[1].

This was the postulate that underlay all Jewish conceptions of property. Theories that used to obtain in Judea might not meet all the detailed requirements of our own times and civilization. Still our confidence in the structural principles of the Hebrew economy is such as to assure us that no system of social or political ethics out of consonance with them merits regard, or can permanently obtain. There is in ethics, as in physics, but one perpendicular. Plumb-lines are cosmic. Your little house will stand only as it is set in a true vertical with everlasting foundations. A valid administration of social and civil equity is a short line, but it is the little, hither end of the line which, in its infinite reach, makes out all the righteousness of God.

It is only of God, then, that ownership in its absolute sense is predicable. Everything else so designated can be approximation only, and imitation. God owns the world. After that it is only by accommodation of terms that I can say I own my house or my library. Unable to own things as against God, there is still opportunity for us to own them as against each other. Granted. But at the same time the absoluteness of divine ownership does break the back of all human ownership. We are not sure any more as to how much it actually means to own things as against each other; or whether it means anything. John owned his marbles as against Charles, but not as against his father; but that latter qualification took all the stiffening out of his ownership as against Charles. An idea that is absolute becomes nothing more than a caricature so soon as the attempt is made to work it under conditions. The features may some of them be preserved, but with the sacrifice of the identity.

1. The underlying postulate of Judaism, that the earth was in an absolute sense the Lord's, worked determinatively in all the dealings of the Jews with other people. Without originary title to Palestine they conceived that it became theirs by His arbitrary bestowment. God owned it, and made them His heirs. Whether there was any narrowness in their view of the case or not, it gave an assurance and an intensity to their operations that made them irresistible, and carried everything before them. The mere fact that they were settlers in Palestine constituted Hittites, Hivites, and Jebusites aggressors; and to drive them out or exterminate them was, consistently with their view of the case, a simple assertion of vested rights.

It is easy to appreciate this sentiment; easy also, perhaps, to feel some measure of sympathy with it. The remnants of that idea still lurk in the mind of every man that calls God Father. In the filial relation is involved a proprietary claim. For a father to disinherit his child is against nature, and that is because the child is in a way joint-owner of his father's property, even before he has been distinctly pronounced his father's heir. I call God Father. The livelier my sense of filial relation to Him, the stronger and the more effective will be the hold upon me which this same idea will have, that there is nothing which He owns which I also have not at least some small property in Ownership goes with the blood; 'If children then heirs, heirs of God,' Paul writes. 'All things are yours'; 'Whether things present or things to come: all are yours.'

---

[1] L. Abbott, *What Christianity means to me.*

It is worth noticing with what immediate and practical effect this sentiment will operate on a small field. Suppose that I am hungry and can obtain nothing to eat, and have no means of earning it. What am I to do? Starve? I cannot, of course, state what my reader would do; but I can vouch for myself that I should not perish of inanition so long as I had the power to beg bread or to steal it. The loaf on my neighbour's shelf is, in a sense, not mine; but at the same time, in a sense it is mine, because it belongs in a truer sense to God than it does to my neighbour, and I call God Father. Solomon was contemplating just such a case when he wrote: 'Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry.' Of course the law is not going to forgive him. There are times, nevertheless, when the eighth commandment, like the sixth, is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Christ in the twelfth of Matthew distinctly enunciates the doctrine of 'blameless' transgression. The law is for the sake of man, and not man for the sake of the law.

2. When once the idea of God's fatherhood is admitted there enters under its patronage the correlative conception of man's brotherhood. In deepening the sense of our filial relation to God, the gospel has developed the sense of our fraternal relation to one another. To actualize and universalize the idea of the brotherhood of man is the supreme triumph of the gospel. The end towards which the Christian scheme looks is not the salvation of men but the redemption of society. It is society that constitutes the true integer and not the individual man. Society is the unit and every man a fraction. A large half of every individual subsists in his social relations. Almost the first thing that God's Word tells us about man is that it is a mistake for him to be alone; and the last consummating prospect that the same Word holds out before us is of regenerated society. 'A City come down from God.' That is the longest, largest hope that even inspiration can conceive; a condition in which the ideal of unity is fulfilled through the mutual membership which each man has in every other man.

We say that we are members of community, and that we *belong* to society. And that is exactly it: we do *belong* to society. It is very often surprising what an amount of unconscious truth there is in our commonest and most unstudied expressions, and how much sounder oftentimes our words are than our philosophy and our practice. For a slave to belong to a master means that he is subject to the will of that master. For man to belong to a corporation carries with it the idea that in all that relates to that corporation his individual choice and interest are no longer to control him, but that he submits himself to the collective choice and interest of the corporation; belongs to the corporation. A man says he 'belongs to a Church' without half realizing usually the full scope of his own admission. To belong to a Church means that in all that relates to the interests and aims of his Church he is no longer his own. Without doubt there is a great deal of 'belonging to the Church' that really denotes to the member himself nothing more than opportunity of access to the spiritual treasury of the Church—to all intents a kind of ecclesiastical communist, cherishing his connexion for the chance it gives him of holding his hand on the spigot of churchly conferment. Still the term by which he designates his relation is valid, and ought itself to teach him a wholesome lesson and hold him in that condition of subordination to the corporate purposes and interests of the Church which his own language so justly, though unconsciously, implies and confesses. The same kind of admission is tacitly made by any man who speaks of himself as belonging to a certain community, or to society, or to mankind. Nothing more is needed than that he should take the gauge of his own language and be in practice what he is in speech. He does belong to the community; and that means that it behoves him to bridle himself with the general aims of community and saddle himself with its general interests.

3. The sense of brotherhood will prevent men from feeding on each other and making capital out of their necessities. Money-making is always a transaction between two parties, and when conducted in consonance with the Christian conception of property, each party will make account of the other's interests as well as his own. It seems to be considered that business is the art of getting whatever you can without any consideration of equivalents. Making money has taken the place of earning money. This matter is one that has no end to it. The question on the street is not one of value; but rather how much can I get for a thing if I am the seller, or how little can I get along with and pay for the same commodity if I am buyer. Values used to regulate prices; prices at present appear to determine values. And so the stockbrokers study 'quotations' and watch the 'tickers.'

Suppose that I want an article at my grocer's. It happens that he is the only one from whom I can obtain it, and that it is something I cannot get along without. The thing is worth, say, ten cents; but if he appreciates the circumstances he will quite likely charge me fifteen. That is, he will charge me the worth of the article and tax me fifty per cent. extra for the exigency. He loves me, and all that sort of thing; he 'brothers' me in the house of the Lord. It is not good form to gag and pinion me and deplete me burglariously; but if exigencies are snug enough to throttle me, and circumstances sufficiently expert to turn my pockets, he will appropriate the contents with a 'thank you,' call it trade, and invite me to come again. The element of reciprocal interest and reciprocal obligation comes into no kind of account with him. He will twist the screw upon me to the full limit of his courage. He has no conscience and no heart. I stand before him in the same posture that an oil well does to the company that is working it; with no other possible purpose to subserve but to be pumped—pumped dry. His is the true genius of a sucker, that will fasten itself to your arm and love you for the heart's blood it can drain from you. If his dealings with you are not precisely those of a cannibal, it is mostly only accident of birthplace. His methods are those of an old-fashioned Fijian, or wild man of Borneo, only treated to a 'wash' of civilization; so that his brutality is somewhat more refined and his ferocity more polite and ornamental.

Add an illustration along a little different line. Our ladies explore the shops and stores and are constitutional bargain hunters. There are many articles—often the production of sewing-women—which come within the range of their pursuit and needs, that are obtainable at ruinously low prices. In view of such purchases it is not uncommon to hear the lady buyer declare that she does not see how it is possible for the goods to be made and sold for any such money. That is an unconscious confession that she has paid for the goods less than they are worth; and if she understands at all the state of the case it is furthermore a confession that she has allowed herself to make capital out of the extremity of the poor sewing-women, who are paid hardly enough for their work to keep their wretched souls inside of their half-starved bodies. And not only that, but if they will think a little further, they will be reminded that possibly some of the garments of their own wardrobe, purchased so economically as to allow of larger indulgence in other elegancies of attire, were made by hands so scantily remunerated that the sewing-woman's own body had to be put in the market to eke out the miserable pittance; so that perhaps the lady reader of this very page sails up and down the avenues decked in velvet and fur that were paid for in part by her own money and in balance by the hire of the brothel.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Purpose and the Power.

'The power that worketh in us.'—Eph 3[20].

Before we speak of the Power let us understand the occasion for it. Let us understand first what God is aiming at, next how far that aim is from its attainment, and then let us consider the Power at God's disposal for attaining it.

1. It is a tremendous claim which is made in the Epistle to the Ephesians. The old Greek thinkers had dared to dream that somewhere up in heaven, could we but rise above the mists which shut it from our sight, would be found the pattern and the plan of all that is working itself out in the underworld of earth. The writer of the

---

[1] C. H. Parkhurst in *The New Princeton Review*.

Epistle to the Ephesians claims that the dream has become a reality. To him, he declares, that which before had not been made known to the sons of men has now been wonderfully revealed. To his freed spirit has been granted access into 'the heavenly places'; to him has been disclosed the mystery of the Divine Will, 'the purpose of the ages' and the meaning of the world. And he has been pledged to no secrecy; he longs, yearns to communicate the matter, 'to make all men see,' as through his eyes, 'what is the dispensation of the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things.'

(1) Do we ask after the ultimate goal, the end, the aim of the Eternal Purpose? What could be a plainer answer than this? 'That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ; the things which are in heaven and the things which are on earth.'

(2) Do we ask, again, to understand the way in which all this is being accomplished? the present working of the great design, with which it might be supposed that we in our measure could co-operate? Again the answer is given in unhesitating tones. The ideal of a Society is presented to our view; a Society which is to consist of elect representative elements, drawn from all portions of the human race, in order that it may exhibit the full life of the perfect man, and be 'the first fruits' and the pledge, as also the means and the instrument of the ever-increasing fulfilment of the purpose of the Creation and Redemption; that now 'might be known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Such is the ultimate goal and such the method by which it is being attained.

2. But when we turn from our vision of 'the pattern in the mount' to the sight of that which will meet our eyes in the plane of ordinary experience, we shall find the actual falling terribly far short of the heavenly ideal. Not to speak of 'the evil that is in the world,' we shall find in the Church which is to exhibit the type of the true life much, it will be well if sometimes we are not almost compelled to think everything, that is most contrary to its high vocation. We shall find low aims, unspiritual motives, miserable distractions, rivalries, misunderstandings, confusions. Sometimes it will seem as if there was not greater but even less power of perception and understanding in the Church than in the world. We shall be reminded of the old and bitter complaint, 'Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent?' The evil will appear everywhere prevalent, sometimes predominant, and, greater misery still, we shall find that 'the good with good is at cross purposes.' Yes, and most certain of all, we shall find that all which we see without has its likeness in our own hearts—that the evil and confusion are there also, mocking our hope from within.

What, then, if the awful doubt should come, whether after all we can be certain that there is any great purpose of good steadily working to an appointed end? In such hours most assuredly we shall feel our need of something more than words and promises; something by which to reassure ourselves and others; some solid and substantial proof, some guarantee, some sign if it might be, to support and strengthen faith. So faith asks for a sign. It shall be given, and most liberally. A twofold sign, 'in the heaven above, and on the earth beneath': a sign that may avail for the moments of silent thought and a sign that may be ours, within and around, in the very heart of work and conflict.

(1) First there is the sign in the heaven above. It is the presentation of an object to thought, a great accomplished fact upon which the mind can fix and steady itself. It is the sign of *the Christ risen.* He who lived on earth and died is now by God raised and glorified and set there in man's nature as proof and evidence of the certainty of man's destiny, as well as of the glory which is in store for the Church which is His Body. To Him the soul of the Christian may turn as the needle to the pole, and the effect of such a turning will be peace. As often as we can truly 'lift up our hearts unto the Lord' shall we know of a certainty that our redemption is no vain hope, shall we grow in the assurance that in spite of all seeming to the contrary it is moving onward, drawing nigh.

(2) And there is the sign in the earth beneath: which is given as the result and so in its turn as the further evidence of that glorification of the Christ. It is *the Spirit given.* Given to be the 'seal,' and 'the earnest': these are the expressions employed, as you will remember, in this Epistle. 'The Spirit of promise,' whose coming is according to promise: yes, and whose presence is itself the pledge and promise of all that the future is to bring. How absolute and habitual was the Apostle's re-

liance upon the assurance so given will be seen at once by a glance over the pages which contain his words. It is not much to say that every desire, every hope of his for those whom he is addressing will be found to be intimately bound up in his mind with the hope which he derives from his sense of the ever continued working of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church of Christ. With this strong conviction to support him he feels that he need set no limit to his prayers and expectations: or here is a 'mighty power' which is 'able to do exceeding abundantly above all' he or any may 'ask or think.'

3. We have found the Power. Does the apostle believe that the eyes of his readers may be enlightened to see afresh the vision of the possibilities of their calling in Christ Jesus? It is because he can invoke for them the aid of 'a Spirit of wisdom and understanding.' Does he confidently expect to see them raised and lifted into yet more intimate relation with the spiritual sphere? It is because he is sure that there is already at work in them a quickening resurrection power. Does he further dare to hope to see them knit together into a true and vital fellowship with all the Saints? It is because he is persuaded that there is a 'unity of the Spirit,' a great reconciling influence by which even Jew and Gentile may be brought into one family of the Father. Or again, is he urging upon them the necessity of a higher moral standard than that of their former heathen state? He points his appeal by recalling to their thoughts the presence of 'the Holy Spirit of God' within their souls. If they are to reach the richest joy of which their nature is capable, he tells them that they must 'be filled with the Spirit.' And he is confident that from 'the Spirit's calm excess' will follow not any sort of disorder, but the dutiful subjection and mutual subordination of Christian Service.

For St. Paul then the thought, the message of Christianity, would have been most incomplete without this third element, this indispensable witness to its truth. For him the great story of the Purpose of the Father, to be accomplished through the transforming of men into the likeness of the Perfection of the Son, would have wanted the most convincing attestation of its truth had it not been possible to appeal to unmistakable signs of the Power of the Holy Ghost. Here was the proof that all was not a dream of the fervid imagination. Here was that which could enable him to rejoice in a mission and ministry more exceeding glorious than that of the ancient lawgiver, inasmuch as it was a ministry 'not in word only but in power.'[1]

---

[1] A. W. Robinson, in *The Cambridge Review*.

◆

Two Commentaries on the Apocalypse.

By the Rev. W. D. Niven, M.A., Causewayend United Free Church, Aberdeen.

To collect and read even all the noteworthy books that have been written explanatory of the Apocalypse would be a life-task. No book of Scripture has been found so mysterious, and probably in consequence none so fascinating. The Revelation at any rate has proved to be *facile princeps* as a stimulus to expositors. There is, however, no need to read all the long series of Commentaries. For successive generations of scholars have sifted and stored for their own age all that was best in the work of their predecessors. In our own day two commentaries have appeared which are necessary for any one who would be abreast of modern study of the Apocalypse, and master of all the best that has gone before. I do not mean that readers can afford to scrap all the former works on the subject; some of the older are excellent, and deserve not only respect but continued attention. But these two new books will for some considerable time hold a commanding and authoritative position.

One is English and Protestant,[1] the other is French-Swiss and Roman Catholic.[2] They have their resemblances and they have their differences, and one will do well to balance them against each other. The last word on the Apocalypse has not yet been said. It is certainly not said in either of these two. But in a judicious combination of the two we may find the last and best word that can be said meanwhile.

---

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D., 2 vols., pp. cxcii + 373, 497 ('Internat. Crit. Com.'). Edinburgh, 1920.

[2] *Saint Jean, l'Apocalypse.* Par le P. E.-B. Allo, des Frères Prêcheurs, Professeur à l'Université de Fribourg (Suisse), pp. cclxviii + 373 ('Études Bibliques,' Librairie V. Lecoffre). Paris, 1921.

It was an unfortunate coincidence that both works were going through the press almost at the same time, so that one author had no opportunity to see the final results arrived at by the other. Dr. Charles's views on apocalyptic problems, however, were fairly well known before. Professor Allo knows them and from time to time refers to them, and in such a way that one may guess what he would have to say about some of the most striking positions occupied by Dr. Charles. Let it be noted here how fair both writers are in their statement of the views of others. It is very easy for any one discussing the theories of some expounders of the Apocalypse to be contemptuous. Of that there is no note here. It is also specially pleasing to find how cordially Professor Allo can acknowledge and commend the scholarship of Protestant commentators. Of, *e.g.*, Ramsay and Swete he has a very high opinion, characterizing the latter as 'commentateur profond, érudit et pieux.' 'Son ouvrage, qui pourrait presque être signé d'un catholique, est celui auquel nous devons le plus pour nôtre commentaire.'

In each case the Introduction, which is naturally the most interesting part, covers much the same ground and discusses the same problems, as indeed is inevitable. In each case the completed work represents many years of patient study. In each case, whether one accepts conclusions or not, one cannot but recognize that they are the fruits of honest thought. Both give what amounts to a grammar of the language. Both give a very complete and skilfully classified list of former works on the Apocalypse. It may be said generally that while Dr. Charles's views are radical, those of Professor Allo are conservative; but the radicalism is not 'subjectivism run wild,' nor is the conservatism mere traditionalism. Each adduces reasons for the faith that is in him. We may not find the reasons in either case always satisfying, but the reasons are there, and always deserve consideration.

Let us compare the Introductions on some points in detail. Perhaps the two most interesting questions that can be asked about the Apocalypse are—(1) Who was the author? (2) Is the book a unity?

i. First, then, as to authorship. According to Allo there is no solid ground for dissenting from the traditional view, the author was John the son of Zebedee, who wrote all the Johannine portions of N.T.

According to Charles, John the Apostle probably fell a martyr before A.D. 70, and wrote no part of N.T. Further, a distinction of authorship must be drawn between the Johannine Gospel and Epistles on the one hand and the Apocalypse on the other. Gospel and Epistles are by John the Elder, Revelation by another John—John the Prophet.

Let us ask first, are all the Johannine writings by one author? 'Yes,' answers Allo; 'No,' says Charles. The only serious objection to unity of authorship lies in the language. It is so serious that Charles finds it unnecessary to adduce any other argument. The vocabulary, idiom, and grammatical usages of the Apocalypse differ not only in marked but in startling degree from those of the Gospel and Epistles. That is obvious to the most superficial observer. Allo fully and frankly admits it. Yet in spite of it, he holds that the same man may quite well be the writer of both. He shows that apart from mere language there are discernible striking resemblances between the two groups of writings, and he gives an explanation of the linguistic differences. He shows that in spirit, doctrine, and certain peculiarities of style and composition, there are strong similarities, and that even in vocabulary and grammar the resemblances are more numerous than at the first glance one discovers. Charles himself recognizes those likenesses which, he says, necessitate the belief that there is some connexion between Gospel and Apocalypse; either the Seer is a disciple of the Elder, or both are disciples of one master.

The differences of vocabulary, etc., Allo would explain by the different circumstances of composition. To John, Greek remained a foreign tongue in which he was never quite at home. He was translating all the time. In exile, his soul thrilled and excited by inexpressible visions, he would not be likely to write so good Greek as he could in times of quiet leisure in a Greek atmosphere amid a Greek-speaking populace. Besides, for the better Greek of the Gospel we may be indebted to an amanuensis who polished the language, purified the idiom and corrected the grammar.

It will be seen that while Allo's problem is to account for the differences, Charles's problem is to explain the resemblances. On the whole, I think that Allo is the more successful.

Next let us ask, supposing that there were only one writer of all Johannine Scriptures, was he the son of Zebedee? Once more Allo answers 'Yes,' and Charles says emphatically 'No.' The main and most interesting objection to the traditional view is that there is respectable evidence that John the Apostle was martyred before any of the documents in question by any probability could have been written. It is the gravest defect of Allo's work that while he mentions this objection more than once, he does not deal with it seriously. He seems to take it for granted that if it can be shown that we have only one John as author, this John may be forthwith identified with the Apostle. But what if he was slain before A.D. 70? There is a tradition to that effect. Allo apparently thinks it negligible. Charles is inclined, to say the least, to regard it as trustworthy. He adduces for it all the evidence known. Some of the evidence is valueless, some is ambiguous, none of it is quite conclusive. After all, the only clear statement that John the Apostle was martyred by the Jews occurs in a quotation from Papias found in Georgius Hamartolus (9th cent.), and in a 7th or 8th cent. Oxford MS. of an epitome of the Chronicle of Philip of Sidé (5th cent.), and this Papias-tradition has been rejected by such scholars as Zahn, Harnack, Armitage Robinson, Drummond, and Stanton. The whole question will be found very ably discussed by A. E. Brooke in *D.A.C.*, vol. i. p. 627. The statement adduced from Philip of Sidé is perhaps not so weighty as Brooke thinks; still, a very clear assertion of the testimony of Papias to the martyrdom of John is there, and it is difficult to explain it away. When we further reflect that the canonicity of the Apocalypse was the subject of keen controversy in the East, and that for centuries Eastern Churches did not accept it, it must be admitted that the son-of-Zebedee authorship is somewhat more problematical than Allo admits. No 'find' is so much to be desiderated as a recovery of Papias' work.

Charles's other arguments are, John the Seer describes himself not as an Apostle but as a prophet, and down to A.D. 180 no ecclesiastical writer mentions a residence of the Apostle in Asia Minor. Justin, who lived in Ephesus 135 A.D., has no reference to the Apostle's sojourn there. Neither point is conclusive. If an Apostle can describe himself as an Elder (1 P 5^1), there is no reason why an Elder should not call himself a Prophet. The argument from silence is so precarious that it should not be used. Justin, it is interesting to note, makes definite mention of only one N.T. book, and it is the Apocalypse, and he distinctly attributes it to John the Apostle.

ii. Second let us ask, is the Apocalypse, as we have it, from one hand? Charles and Allo are here at opposite poles. Allo makes a doubtful exception of one passage only (14^{14-20}) as of independent origin. Charles thinks that no less than a fifth part of the book is derived from various sources; these parts, however, being skilfully worked in, so as not to destroy real unity. But what is characteristic of Charles's view is his discovery of an 'editor' whose work is such as to necessitate language that is unusual in modern scholarship. To begin with, the editor is 'very unintelligent.' As Charles's wrath rises, the editor becomes 'a narrow ascetic,' and soon reaches 'the climax of his stupidity,' 'betrays a depth of stupidity all but incomprehensible,' and appears to be 'an arch heretic of the first century,' probably without knowing it, who, 'despite his abysmal stupidity and heresies, has achieved immortality by securing a covert in the great work which he has done so much to discredit and obscure.' In 20^{13} 'dishonesty has taken the place of incapacity. The editor has tampered with his master's text.' Finally, 'this shallow-brained fanatic and celibate, whose dogmatism varies directly with the narrowness of his understanding, has often stood between John and his readers for nearly 2000 years.'

Dr. Charles's work commands respect for many notable excellences, but it will be felt by many that this trouncing of the 'editor' is a blemish which makes an unpleasant impression. It is not certain after all that this editor is not a man of straw. One will grant to Charles the usual privilege of knocking him down, but surely he does not need to stamp upon him with such Whitechapel fury, or to howl such scholarly Billingsgate over his mangled remains. A less violent 'showing up' would be more effective.

Redactors have played such a convenient and overworked part in so many critical theories that some of us are rather tired and suspicious of them. Every Biblical scholar should have a large-print card above his desk—*Redactores non fingo*. What, after all, is the evidence for the activity of an editor in the Apocalypse? As adduced by Dr. Charles, it is by no means of overwhelming weight. It is partly linguistic—he writes better Greek than John. But if we argue that the Apocalypse cannot be by the writer of the Fourth Gospel because of its bad Greek, and then argue that because the Greek in places is not so bad after all we have to assume an editor, we have the feeling that somewhere we are either begging a question or reasoning in a circle. The other great evidence, according to Charles, lies in what he takes to be dislocations, interpolations, etc., which often 'make chaos' of what he supposes John to have written or intended to write. To say the least, this is curious. We can conceive an editor trying to correct dislocations, that indeed is his function, we cannot picture one outside an asylum proceeding to 'make chaos' of what he found orderly arranged. Surely this is the strangest prank ever charged upon an editor that he should make the original work less intelligible than he found it, or throw new material together in haphazard fashion. Even an 'abysmally stupid' editor would know better than, in an attempt to make his author speak better Greek, make him speak nonsense; nor would he insert in a passage that was plain as it stood, words that make it an enigma. Yet such, according to Charles, was the task that this editor set himself, or at least accomplished. That glosses may creep into a text, that words may be mistaken or misplaced in a long process of transcription, is very easily understood. But an editorial activity of this kind is not very credible.

Some of Charles's evidence for a stupid interference with the text will be felt to be worthless. Take this: 'In 8^5 he (the editor) represents our author as saying, *βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαί*. But our author knows well that the *ἀστραπαί* always precede the *βρονταί*, cf. 4^5 11^{19} 16^{18}. But apparently this editor neither knew this fact nor his master's usage.' It is sufficient to reply, '*Donner und Blitzen!*', which not only relieves one's feelings, but affords a complete answer to such a pedantic criticism.

Or take 20^{13}, the passage where 'incapacity has become dishonesty, and the editor has tampered with his master's text.' 'The sea can give up bodies, not souls. Yet the phrase "the dead" implies personalities, *i.e.* souls. Besides, the sea had already vanished, 20^{11}.' Charles therefore puts out 'sea,' and restores what he takes to be the original 'treasuries,' *i.e.* the common Jewish word for the abode of the souls of the righteous. This, he points out, counterbalances Hades, which in this book always denotes the abode of the souls of the wicked. But then Charles has nothing to say about 'Death.' Whose souls are given up by 'Death'? The editor, he says, substituted 'sea' in the interests of his doctrine of bodily resurrection. Many will think that there is exceedingly little convincing force in such argumentation. Charles is treating highly pitched poetry as though it were not merely sober but scientific prose.

His whole standpoint is vitiated by this. His criticism of the structure of the Apocalypse is purely literary. Now, as Allo would remind us, we are dealing not with a collection of documents, but with a series of 'visions'; and, apart from 'spiritual insight,' psychology must play a part in any attempt to grasp the situation, which is a necessary preliminary to any real exposition. It is not an evidence of an interfering and stupid editor, it is only what psychology leads us to expect, if we find that 'visions' more or less 'interfere' with one another; that, in place of that steady development of theme which Charles desiderates, there should be a series of flashes playing alternately on this and that topic; that a new great thought should be obtruding itself before its predecessor had been fully grasped, and that then there should be a re-emergence of the former. What, from a purely literary or logical standpoint may appear something of a hotch-potch, may perfectly well be psychologically a true representation of the process of 'visions.'

If with Allo we hold that the whole work (with one exceptional passage) is what it professes to be —a series of 'visions' experienced by one seer— there is no need for such an editor.

Hence we conclude with what we began, Charles should be read along with Allo or with Swete, whom Allo largely follows, and whose work is more accessible for English readers.

In works on Astronomy, while long discussions are introduced as to the sun-spots, little is said of the incalculable debt we all owe to the great luminary. So it is perhaps natural that, in writing on such works as these, one should spend himself mainly on what he finds doubtful or unsatisfying. After all, then, let it be gratefully admitted that such doubtful matters are but sun-spots. Dr. Charles has given us a magnificent fruit of his twenty-odd years of study. He has enhanced English scholarship and laid all N.T. students under deep obligation. We rejoice likewise in Professor Allo's notable contribution to Roman Catholic exegetical and critical science. He demonstrates that it is a science and not a tradition, and that the results are well worth attention. Messrs. Clark and the Librairie V. Lecoffre, the respective publishers, deserve hearty congratulations.

◆

Contributions and Comments.

Enoch and 2 Corinthians.

All students of the New Testament are aware that there is no book outside the Biblical Canon which has had so much influence upon the language and thought of the N.T. as the apocryphal Book of Enoch. It is quite superfluous to make over again the demonstration of the foregoing statement, but if we regard it as a fact about which every one can easily assure himself, we must also be prepared to find more traces of the book in Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse than have yet been pointed out. I propose to show that there is a passage in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians which will acquire luminosity (in the case to which we shall refer a much needed luminosity) by a comparison with a passage in the Book of Enoch. We have lately had an extraordinary stimulus to textual criticism in the renewed proofs which Harnack has given us of the dependence of Tertullian upon the actual Latin text of Marcion's New Testament. In the fourth and fifth books of Tertullian's treatise against Marcion, he is following Marcion step by step through his own 'Instrument': and, as Harnack points out, this raises the Latin text of the quotations made by Tertullian to the very front rank amongst our textual authorities. When Tertullian comes to the third chapter of 2 Co., with its account of the vail that Moses put upon his face to hide the irradiating splendour from the dazzled Israelites, he follows the Apostle in the demonstration that the vail which was once an external bar to vision has now become an internal vail, folded over the hearts of the Jews, who hear but do not understand. 'We are transfigured,' says he, 'in our contemplation of Christ by the same image by the glory, wherewith Moses was transfigured,' by the glory of the Lord into glory. Thus he sets forth the corporeal glory of Moses arising from his interview with the Lord, and the corporeal vail required by the inability of the people to look upon it, and he sets over this the spiritual glory in Christ, as from the Lord of Spirits ('Tanquam a domino, inquit, spirituum').

The last clause is that we are accustomed to read as follows:

> A.V., 'even as by the Spirit of the Lord';
> R.V., 'even as from the Lord the Spirit';

the Authorized Version informing us that the literal Greek is:

> 'even as of the Lord the Spirit.'

Now, without discussing the *crux interpretum* furnished by the passage in the existing Greek text, we are struck by the fact that Marcion has quite a different reading. According to him the glory of the illuminated believer is a glory *as if from the Lord of Spirits.* He read in 2 Co 3^{18}:

> καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνευμάτων.

We must not put this aside hastily, for, in the first place, Marcion's text has the right of way, when it cannot be shown to be influenced by his own peculiar views: and in the next place, the expression *the Lord of Spirits* is one of the most common terms in the Book of Enoch, where it occurs, according to Charles's enumeration, 104 times. Is it possible, then, that St. Paul (like St. Peter and St. Jude) is under the influence of Enoch? Is there any passage in Enoch which speaks of an illumination of the saints by glory from the Lord of Spirits? In En 38 we have an account of the judgments that are coming upon the ungodly: it is said of them that:

> They shall not be able to behold the face of the holy,
> For the Lord of Spirits has caused his light to appear
> On the face of the holy, righteous and elect.

Upon which Charles notes:

> His light transfigures His saints.

But this is precisely what the Apostle is saying in 2 Co., and even the reference to Moses is involved in the passage of Enoch in the words:

> They shall not be able to behold the face of the holy;

and here is the desired reference to the glory of the Lord of Spirits. Evidently, then, Marcion's text is the correct one, though it has no Greek attestation and no other Latin or Syriac attestation. It must be restored, and on the margin there must be added a reference to En 38.

RENDEL HARRIS.

Manchester.

* * *

A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament.

PROFESSOR ABBOTT-SMITH'S *Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, recently published, supplies a much-felt need of our time. I do not know of any other Lexicon of the New Testament of so convenient a size, and at such a moderate cost, that compresses the same valuable material into the smallest possible space.

Professor Moulton examined part of the work in MS., and his commendation is of itself a sufficient guarantee of its usefulness to the working student.

A very interesting feature of the Lexicon is the constant reference to the usage of the Septuagint, the study of which has grown immensely of recent years, because the Vocabulary of this venerable version has a most important bearing on the diction of the New Testament. About 40 per cent. of the words of the Septuagint are to be found in this Lexicon alone. The Hebrew original for each word that occurs in the Septuagint is also given. One example out of many will illustrate what I mean. Take the rare word *γλωσσόκομον*.

> † *γλωσσόκομον*, *-ου*, *τό*, vernac. form of cl. *γλωσσοκομεῖον* (*γλῶσσα*, *κομέω*), [in LXX for אָרוֹן, 2 K 6^{11}, 2 Ch $24^{8.\ 10.\ 11*}$;]
>
> 1. = cl—*εῖον* (*v. supr.*), a case for holding the reeds or tongues of musical instruments.
>
> 2. As in LXX, *π.* (M.M., *s.v.*), a box, chest: Jn 12^{6} 13^{29} †.

This is surely concise enough, yet there is no obscurity. We find that the word *γλωσσόκομον* occurs twice in the N.T. and four times in the O.T., and that in the latter it is the translation of the Heb. אָרוֹן, a chest or box. *γλωσσόκομον* is the vernacular form of the classical *γλωσσοκομεῖον*, and reference is also made to Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. The † or dagger at the beginning denotes that the word is not found in Greek writers of the Classical period; while the dagger at the end denotes that all the instances of the word's occurrence in the N.T. have been cited.

The asterisk * after the list of passages from 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles signifies that the word occurs nowhere else in the Septuagint. One could give many other examples, all showing the usefulness of the work, its combination of clearness and conciseness, its thorough up-to-dateness, and its full recognition of the supreme importance of the study of the vernacular Greek, the language of the New Testament.

JOHN KELLAS.

Rathen Parish Church.

* * *

Christ's Diagnosis of Disease at Bethesda.

> *ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . λέγει αὐτῷ, θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι.*—JOHN 5^{6}.
>
> 'Jesus saith unto him, Wouldest thou be made whole?'—R.V.
>
> 'Do you want your health restored?'—MOFFATT.
>
> 'Do you wish to have health and strength?'—WEYMOUTH.
>
> 'Wouldst thou get well?'—CUNNINGTON.

THIS was the curious and abrupt inquiry with which Jesus introduced Himself to the invalid at Bethesda—surely the strangest question ever asked of a patient in a hospital? It violates the usual relationship between the patient and the physician. 'If thou wilt,' said the leper to Jesus, 'thou canst make me clean.'

Certainly Jesus, who was always saying unexpected things, never asked a more unexpected question. The words must have sounded rude and impertinent to those who lay in the next berths around the bath, waiting for its waters to bubble. Townsend, in his book on Europe and Asia, points out that the West is pitiful and the East callous. But we think at first that this question is more than callous; it is cruel! and that the old man who lay sickly on his mattress grave might reasonably have replied: 'Young man, my presence here is a proof of my desire to be cured. Every one here knows that I am the father of the house, for I have been coming here since before you were born!'

But the patient did not so answer the question of Jesus. Instead of doing so, he rattled off an oft-repeated explanation of why his turn never came for healing, whilst countless others of this great brotherhood of the bandage had recovered. For Jesus by His first question had diagnosed the case correctly.

1. This man is the classic instance in the New Testament of one who suffered from the malady of not wanting, who came to the right place in the wrong spirit.

'Wilt thou be made whole?' *i.e.* 'hast thou the will? The question was suggested by the circumstances of the man's case. It might seem that he acquiesced in his condition, and was unwilling to make any vigorous effort to gain relief. The words of Jesus were fitted to awaken attention, hope, effort, in one who had fallen into apathy. Cf. Acts iii. 4' (Westcott).

The condition of cure, often in the case of physical, and always in the case of spiritual ailments, is willingness to be made whole.

> 'I doubt if the sorrowful gates of illness behold anything more entirely pitiable than the spectacle of a will upon crutches.'—*The Corner of Harley Street.*
>
> '"But you are hopeful? Yes or no." The doctor looked at Prince Aribert. "No!" he said shortly. "I am not. I am never hopeful when the patient is not on my side."'—ARNOLD BENNETT, *The Grand Babylon Hotel.*
>
> 'She's made up her mind to die, and the doctor can't argue her out of the notion. Her heart is weak, and if it begins flutterin' it may stop for ever just because the poor old dear won't will it to go on wigglin'.'—H. A. VACHELL, *Quinneys.*
>
> 'A chronicler relates that the body of St. Martin of Tours had in 887 been secretly transported to some remote hiding-place for fear of Danish invasion. When the time came for bringing it home again, there were in Touraine two impotent men who, thanks to their infirmity, gained large sums by begging. They were thrown into great terror by the tidings that the relics were brought back. St. Martin would certainly heal them and take away their means of livelihood.'—P. SABATIER, *Life of St. Francis.*

2. The impotent man may probably have been in such a morbid condition that not only was he reconciled to his disease and weakness, but was also actually proud of his condition. Such pride is not uncommon in the pervert, and is a worse thing than the malady of not wanting. To the Japanese there is beauty in a certain kind of blemish in the work of the potter—a beauty unintelligible to a European. There are those who, by taking thought, have tried to mend a fault which marred their character, and, having failed, appear to find a certain beauty and a cause of boasting in the blemish.

> 'There are people who look upon some disease, either of the body or of the soul, as the best and most precious thing in life. They nurse it all their lives, and only in it do they live at all. Though they suffer by it, yet they live upon it. They complain of it to other people, and by means of it attract to themselves the attention of their neighbours. They use it as a means of obtaining sympathy, and without it—they are nothing at all. Take away from them this disease, cure them, and they will be unhappy, because they are deprived of the only means of living—there they stand empty.'—MAXIM GORKY, *Twenty-Six of Us and One Other.*
>
> 'They discuss their maladies at length, with egotistic enjoyment, sometimes in disgusting detail. Unfailingly, each wishes to persuade the rest that no one else can possibly have such extraordinary complications of cruel suffering. Here illness is a cause of pride and rivalry, a fantastic warrant for an odd self-respect, a sort of decoration in a way.'—A. I. KUPIN, *A Sentimental Romance.*

JOHN G. MORTON.

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Chatham.

Some Old Testament Notes and Queries.

I VENTURE to offer the following suggestions, dealing with a few O.T. passages, for the criticism of readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Gn 6^{16}. We learn from the Icelandic Saga of Kormak that the luck of a house depended on the mete-yard. If the yard was too short, the luck was bad; if too long, good. Is it then grammatically possible to render these words, 'within a cubit shalt thou finish it'? that is, your error must not be more than a cubit. If so, we find here an attempt to secure the luck of the ark.

Gn 49^{24}. Here some authorities read בְּשֵׁם for מִשָּׁם—'by the name of' for 'from thence.' If we accept this reading, it would seem likely that we ought to regard the whole phrase—'By the name of the Keeper of the Stone of Israel'—as the editor's account of the original version of the Song: 'These are the words I found, but I have substituted the Mighty One of Israel for the Keeper of the Stone.' That a divinity was often conceived as residing in a stone might of course be proved by a hundred examples.

Gn $49^{4.\,18}$. I have long thought that here we have instances of the transference of musical notes to the running text. If for the useless and almost ungrammatical עָלָה we substitute סֶלָה, we get sense, and at the same time reduce the verse to normal limits. So, too, the whole of $v.^{18}$ might well be taken as the suggestion of the tune to which this part of the song is to be sung. Similarly, in Ps 87^{7}, the hint was long ago given to me by a friend that the real meaning is simply 'Full orchestra and chorus: Tune, All my springs are in thee'; but I do not remember seeing this interpretation in a commentary.

Many scholars are inclined to assign Job 28, with its description of mining, to Zophar the Naamathite. It has struck me that if this view be accepted, we may see why Naamah is represented in Gn 4 as the sister of Tubal-Cain the iron-worker. If Naamah was a city famous for mining, we can understand both why Tubal-Cain should be connected with it and why Zophar should know so much of mining. Again, that Tubal-Cain is the son of Zillah (shadow) may point to the universally recognized connexion between the dwarfs (the regular miners) and darkness. Several of the Norse names for dwarfs are based on this connexion. That Tubal-Cain is a brother of Jubal reminds one of the marked fondness of the dwarfs for music.

Admitting the likelihood of frequent admissions of marginal notes into a MS. text, I cannot see why in Ps 22^{3} 'the words of my groaning' should not be taken as such a note. The phrase exactly describes the contents of $vv.^{2.\,3}$. So too, in $v.^{4}$, 'the praises of Israel' is best taken as another marginal note, summarizing the verses that follow. In both these cases sense and metre are alike mended by throwing out these words.

In Sayce's *Hittites*, p. 22, the עַמּוֹ of Nu 22^{5} is treated as a proper name, equivalent to the 'Amma of the monuments: a city in the neighbourhood of Pethor. I should be glad to know if this identification commends itself to scholars; to translate עַמּוֹ, as 'his people,' seems very unsatisfactory.

E. E. KELLETT.

Leys School, Cambridge.

◆

Entre Nous.

ACCIDY.

1. *What is accidy?* 'Accidy' is just an old-fashioned word for a certain kind of melancholy: and it is the fourth of the Seven Deadly Sins. This is a little startling. We are apt to think of it, especially when it occurs in ourselves, as a misfortune to be pitied and perhaps even (see Byron, *passim*) to be proud of. So we are surprised and indignant to find it classed by the Church as one of the Seven Deadly Sins. Yet there it is—ἀκηδία in the old Greek fathers, latinized as *accidia*,

in English, accidy, or if we prefer modern English, plain melancholy. It looks rather as if the Fathers of the Church had made a mistake. Perhaps. We know that they made some rather serious mistakes about the world: and some still more serious ones about God. But we are beginning to find out that though they did not express their knowledge in the terms we would use to-day, they made fewer mistakes about human nature than has often been supposed. Let us see now if they were mistaken here.

What does a modern philosopher like William James say about melancholy? He calls it 'an incapacity for joyous feeling, which may rise to positive and active anguish, a sort of psychical neuralgia wholly unknown to healthy life. Such anguish may partake of various characters, having sometimes more the quality of loathing; sometimes that of irritation and exasperation; or again of self-mistrust and self-despair; or of suspicion, anxiety, trepidation, fear. The patient may rebel or submit; may accuse himself, or accuse outside powers; and he may or he may not be tormented by the theoretical mystery of why he should so have to suffer.'[1]

These are the words of one of the giants of modern mental science. But if we go back eleven centuries we find St. John of Damascus describing the very same state as 'a sorrowfulness so weighing down the mind that there is no good it likes to do. It has attached to it as its inseparable comrade a distress and weariness of soul, and a sluggishness in all good works, which plunges the whole man into lazy languor, and works in him a constant bitterness.'[2] In short, to use a still earlier phrase, the man in this black condition 'despairs of all the labour which he has taken under the sun' and a 'horror of great darkness' falls upon him. This is 'the poisonous morbid mood of accidia'[3] which mediæval Christians found so tormenting, and regarded as a deadly sin.

Nowadays, especially since the Great War, we are quite aware that it exists, but few people seem to think it is blameworthy. Yet look at its consequences. From sadness such as this come forth (as St. Gregory says) 'malice, grudging, faint-heartedness, despair, torpor as to that which is commanded, and the straying of the mind after that which is forbidden.'[4] 'Sloth that will not suffer hardness or penance'; and 'wanhope, that is, despair of the mercy of God.' 'Then cometh somnolence, that is, sluggish slumbering, which maketh a man heavy and dull in body and in soul; negligence or recklessness that recketh of nothing, whether he do it well or badly; idleness, that is the gate of all harms; *tarditas*, as when a man is belated, or held back, before he will turn to God; slackness, that is, he that when he beginneth any good work, anon he will give it up and stop; a kind of coldness, that freezeth all the heart of a man; undevotion, through which a man is so dull that he may neither read nor sing in holy Church, nor labour with his hands in any good work; then waxeth he sluggish and sleepy, and soon will he be wroth, and soon is inclined to hate and to envy.'[5] Does it not seem possible that anything which brings about such ugly consequences is very close to sin? It is true that it is a misfortune, but is it not our own fault? Except in a few cases, where the mind is positively and chronically diseased, this is true. There are, indeed, some who are more naturally prone to such a state than others, but that only means that a greater or less effort is required according to the individual constitution. It is certain that by far the greater part of the suffering endured in this Valley of the Shadow of Death is avoidable, and that the majority of such sufferers accept as a doom those mental idiosyncrasies which ought to be taken only as a challenge.

2. *Who sin by accidy?* It differs from many other sins into which we are tempted to fall in that it is a sin or a malady, or both, to which as a rule it is the finer and more sensitive natures that are subject. It is Wordsworth who says,

I lost
All feeling of conviction, and, in fine,
Sick, wearied out with contrarieties,
Yielded up moral questions in despair.
This was the crisis of that strong disease,
This the soul's last and lowest ebb; I drooped,
Deeming our blessèd reason of least use
When wanted most.[6]

---

[1] W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 147.

[2] *De Orth. Fid.*

[3] John Kelman.

[4] *Moralium Liber*, xxxi.

[5] Chaucer, *The Parson's Tale* (condensed).

[6] 'The Prelude,' bk. xi.

For this reason the sensitiveness of youth, especially youth with keen intellect and physical strength somewhat overtasked by growth and hard work, is particularly prone to it, as any sympathetic university or secondary-school teacher knows. The very presence of young enthusiasm makes depression darker when it comes spiritually with doubt, or physically with exhaustion. As the brightest flowers look the dismallest upon dark days, so the brightest natures are the gloomiest when things go very wrong. In the hour of their depression the recovery of belief in God seems impossible, the toil of life unbearable. The awful shadow of the unknown lies heaviest on these; they feel the darkness more, and question it more bitterly. When they sin against their Father, their remorse is so keen that sin seems unforgiveable. As kind as God seems when they are happy and excited, so severe does He seem when they are unhappy. Excessively in enthusiasm for work when all goes well, they are beyond just measure chilled when all goes ill. In the same way the poets (one of whose chief characteristics is unfailing youth) are full of it. The completest portrayal of it in fairly modern English literature is James Thomson's *City of Dreadful Night*, but there is a shorter, though very famous, description of it in Matthew Arnold's 'Summer Night':

Most men in a brazen prison live,
Where, in the sun's hot eye,
With heads bent o'er their toil, they languidly
Their lives to some unmeaning taskwork give,
Dreaming of nought beyond their prison-wall.
And as, year after year,
Fresh products of their barren labour fall
From their tired hands, and rest
Never yet comes more near,
Gloom settles slowly down over their breast.
And while they try to stem
The waves of mournful thought by which they
  are prest,
Death in their prison reaches them,
Unfreed, having seen nothing, still unblest.

And, surprisingly at first sight, others who feel it sorely are the great humorists, who are often the greatest melancholiacs. In all lofty imaginations there is a touch of sadness, and those who know the most of the value of life know best its brittleness. And these men, with their wit and their humour, their fun, their wide acquaintance with the finest breathings of the human heart, are also very sad men. The man who created Falstaff and ancient Pistol, Beatrice and Mercutio, wrote *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. Most surprising of all, not only is such a mood possible to a Christian, it is in its fullness peculiar to a Christian. There is a depth of darkness which, as Bunyan cleverly changes his text from Jeremiah to tell us 'no man (*but a Christian*) passes through.' Only those who have lived in the glory of God's face can imagine the full bitterness of the times when that face is hidden.

3. *What causes accidy?* What are the causes of this mysterious assault on the energy and integrity of fine minds? If we look into them a little, we shall begin to understand why it has been classed as a sin, alien, as all sin is, to the spirit of Christianity, for of its five chief causes, most are not very creditable, and all are founded on something that has gone wrong with 'the true man God designed.'[1]

A certain proportion of it we can safely dismiss as beginning in that not very noble quality, mere affectation. There are people, especially among those who like to think of themselves as possessing what they call the artistic temperament, who deliberately cultivate a certain amount of melancholy. They like to look in the glass and think how gracefully miserable they are. Like the gentleman in the old play, they say, in effect,

Welcome, folded arms, and fixed eyes,
A sigh that piercing mortifies,
A look that's fastened to the ground,
A tongue chained up, without a sound![2]

But they forget that pose is sometimes dangerous. If we stay too long in one position we cannot get out of it easily, and this is as true of the soul as it is of the arm or leg.

But if we turn to the sincere people we find that melancholy of this kind invariably means that something is wrong. Sometimes, indeed, the cause is merely physical: we are coming to realize

[1] Ibsen, *Peer Gynt*.

[2] Fletcher, 'Hence, all you vain delights.'

nowadays how close is the interaction of body and soul, and how intimately one may affect the other. We look on life through the veil of the physical self, and a change in the veil may deeply affect our outlook. A distinguished scholar used to say that 'he believed in the patience of the saints—except when the wind was in the east.' Closely akin to this type is the melancholy that is part of the natural reaction after a great effort, particularly mental or spiritual. The student knows it well after an examination, the artist after a great creative period, the religious convert only too often after the stress of his new emotions has died down; and the fervent preacher sometimes sees a gloomy universe on Monday. They do not realize it is merely that jaded nerves are distorting their power of perception, just as blue spectacles make us unable to see the full colour of things. Curiously enough, while a great effort may do this, the *absence* of effort, especially when it is habitual, has the same effect. Happiness means vitality, and you can only have vitality when the vital functions are exercised. God did not put us into the world to sit still. So if we do not use the faculties He gave us we cannot expect to have the unclouded outlook on life that comes of the harmonious exercise of our power. Now, this languor, even when it is partly induced by circumstances (it never can be wholly so) may also proceed from selfishness, which is a further cause. A merely self-centred life is bound to have a certain sluggishness of response to spiritual appeals—and no man who cannot so respond is happy: at best he can only drug himself out of thinking.

Physical unfitness, nervous weariness, laziness, selfishness—none of them are very pleasant things. There is a fifth beyond them, a very subtle one, that attacks directly only educated, fairly intellectual people, though through them it may take ill effect on people of less trained minds, as when a quick-witted but mentally untrained working man or a young student accepts the teaching of Nietzsche as a kind of gospel. This cause is intellectual self-centredness—the habit of mind of the man who sees his cosmos in himself, and so builds up an elaborate tower of theory without looking to see if it has real foundations. Stopford Brooke has well described the consequences in the sphere of religion, though in these days we see it also only too often in regard to social and economic problems. In religion, he says, 'they build up theories of theology and explain all things by their theories; but they do not take the pains to bring their theories face to face with the facts of spiritual life. Suddenly their theory is forced into contact with a spiritual fact—the revolt, for example, of the moral sense of men against the punishment of the innocent as an adequate satisfaction for the sin of the guilty—and then the whole theory breaks up into fragments, and they either cling blindly to it in passionate anger, or they are plunged into the despair of eternal night. They become fanatics or infidels. Their dark anger, and their melancholy hopelessness, are alike ignoble.'[1]

4. *What cures accidy?* On looking over the causes already enumerated we see that they all spring from some misuse of the self. A wrong *ideal* for the self causes the 'pose' of melancholy. Too much *regard* for the self causes selfishness and the intellectual egoism referred to in the last paragraph. And it is wrong *use* of the self to neglect its instrument the body or to overstrain or under-employ its energies. Therefore the primary thing is to get right on these points.

The first two remedies are simple and obvious. First, don't caress your disease. We should take Dr. Johnson's advice, 'Make it an invariable and obligatory law to yourself never to mention your own mental diseases. If you are never to speak of them, you will think of them but little; and if you think little of them they will molest you rarely.'[2] Then be quite sure that your body is not deceiving you into, quite literally, a jaundiced view of the Universe. Sydney Smith's famous advice, given in jest, may very well be taken in serious earnest. Our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and the instruments God has given us to see and work in His universe, and surely it is our bounden duty to keep them in working order.

To attend to these points will probably get rid of the accidia in about six cases out of ten, and so set you free to do what God made you for, whatever that is: we may take it in any case that it was not to mope in a corner. But there are the other cases, and for these the remedy is almost always to get away from oneself. There are several ways of doing this. A method which sometimes has almost dramatic success is to make that most amazing and revolutionary discovery that there are other people in the world besides oneself. The fountains of compassion and sympathy and the desire to help are opened, and the soul is refreshed by them. When one has realized this, the next step is to take Keble's advice: 'When you find yourself, as I daresay you sometimes do, overpowered as it were by melancholy, the best way is to go out, and do something kind to somebody or other.' If this is not available (and there are very few occasions when it is not) one can at least fill the mind with something else than one's own concerns. To quote Dr. Johnson again: 'If I were in the country, and were distressed by that malady, I would force myself to take a book; and every time I did it I should find it the easier. Melancholy, indeed, should be diverted by every means but drinking.'

---

[1] *Christ in Modern Life*, 239.

[2] Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ii. 440.

In the long-run it comes to two things. The first is to keep oneself alive to the perpetual miraculousness of life, in the spirit of Stevenson's appeal to 'The Celestial Surgeon':

> If I have faltered more or less
> In my great task of happiness;
> If I have moved among my race
> And shown no glorious morning face;
> If beams from happy human eyes
> Have moved me not; if morning skies,
> Books, and my food, and summer rain
> Knocked on my sullen heart in vain;—
> Lord, Thy most pointed pleasure take
> And stab my spirit broad awake;
> Or, Lord, if too obdurate I,
> Choose Thou, before that spirit die,
> A piercing pain, a killing sin,
> And to my dead heart run them in.

And with this must go the great grace that is called Fortitude—the grace that makes men undertake hard things by their own will wisely and reasonably. Perhaps the truest Fortitude may often be a less heroic, a more tame and business-like affair than we are apt to think. It may be exercised chiefly in doing very little things whose whole value lies in this, that, if one did not hope in God, one would not do them; in secretly dispelling moods which one would like to show; in saying nothing about one's lesser troubles and vexations; in seeing whether it may not be best to bear a burden before one tries to see whither one can shift it; in refusing for one's self excuses which one would not refuse for others. These, anyhow, are ways in which a man may every day be strengthening himself in the discipline of Fortitude, and then, if greater things are asked of him, he is not very likely to draw back from them. For this we need a quiet and sober Fortitude, somewhat like that which Botticelli painted, and Ruskin has described. Let us hear his description of her.

'What is chiefly notable in her is—that you would not, if you had to guess who she was, take her for Fortitude at all. Everybody else's Fortitudes announce themselves clearly and proudly. They have tower-like shields and lion-like helmets, and stand firm astride on their legs, and are confidently ready for all comers. But Botticelli's Fortitude is no match, it may be, for any that are coming. Worn, somewhat, and not a little weary, instead of standing ready for all comers, she is sitting, apparently in reverie, her fingers playing restlessly and idly—nay, I think, even nervously—about the hilt of her sword. For her battle is not to begin to-day; nor did it begin yesterday. Many a morn and eve have passed since it began—and now—is this to be the ending day of it? And if this—by what manner of end? That is what Sandro's Fortitude is thinking, and the playing fingers about the sword-hilt would fain let it fall, if it might be; and yet, how swiftly and gladly will they close on it, when the far-off trumpet blows, which she will hear through all her reverie!'[1]

A TEXT.

'Be fruitful, and multiply.'—Gen. i. 22.

'That command was, according to the old story, delivered to a world inhabited by eight people. It has been handed down to a world in which it has long been ridiculously out of place, and has become merely the excuse for criminal recklessness among a race which has chosen to forget that the command was qualified by a solemn admonition: "At the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man." The high birth-rate has meant a vast slaughter of infants; it has meant, moreover, a perpetual oppression of the workers, disease, starvation, and death among the adult population; it has meant, further, a bloodthirsty economic competition, militarism, warfare. It has meant that all civilization has from time to time become a thin crust over a volcano of revolution, and the human race has gone on lightly dancing there, striving to forget that ancient warning from a soul of things even deeper than the voice of Jehovah: "At the hand of man will I require the life of man." Men have recklessly followed the will-o'-the-wisp which represented mere multiplication of their inefficient selves as the ideal of progress, quantity before quality, the notion that in an orgy of universal procreation could consist the highest good of humanity.'

---

[1] *Mornings in Florence*, iii. 57.

The words are strong: but it is not a tale of little meaning. It is the passionate appeal for birth control of a man who has a right, by long study of and devotion to sex problems, to make it—Mr. Havelock Ellis.

Mr. Ellis has published a volume of *Little Essays of Love and Virtue* (Black; 6s. net). They deal throughout with matters of sex relationship, and they deal with them plainly. But there is no evil. There is the most earnest and responsible will to save life—moral as well as physical—not to destroy it. In such chapters as those on 'The Love Rights of Women' and 'The Play-Function of Sex' there is even the most heart-searching matter for men and husbands.

SOME TOPICS.

Self-Culture.

The poison of self-culture—no matter how reasonable, how enlightened, how successful—is beyond all words deadly.[1]

Patriotism.

It is a truism that patriotism has been lauded and preached and taught to children as a prime virtue: and that it means the desire for the welfare of our own nation; far stronger than the desire for the welfare of other nations, indeed excluding the latter completely. How has it worked? Devilishly—there is no other word for it. The nations, as civilization spread, became more and more united externally by commerce, that is, by growing identity of interests, but along with that and spurred by it they have been infected with the ego-centric spirit of competition, and the result is Pandemonium, or the rendering the whole of this interesting little planet of ours uninhabitable. Of course our way of pursuing self-interest, being British, seemed in our eyes to be on a higher plane than the German way, and doubtless it was more humane, but it was just as self-centred.[2]

Absence of Mind.

Not only did we 'build up the British Empire in a fit of absence of mind'—I heard John Seeley utter those pregnant words on the platform in 1880—but we had no notion, till Parkin and Chamberlain told us, what it was we had done. Thus we were saved from self-complacency by our native blindness; but to-day there is serious risk that our modern efforts to probe the situation will induce the 'swelled head.'[3]

The Spirit of India.

Rabindranath Tagore's new book, *Creative Unity* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), is his best book. That is our deliberate opinion after much reading of his books. How is it best? In insight, in sanity, in religiousness, in revelation of that which it is always his aim to reveal—the spirit of India.

He says:

'The view of this world which India has taken is summed up in one compound Sanskrit word, Sachidānanda. The meaning is that Reality, which is essentially one, has three phases. The first is Sat; it is the simple fact that things are, the fact which relates us to all things through the relationship of common existence. The second is Chit; it is the fact that we know, which relates us to all things through the relationship of knowledge. The third is Ananda: it is the fact that we enjoy, which unites us with all things through the relationship of love.'

---

[1] E. Lyttelton, *Letters on Education*, p. 14.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 16.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 48.

But, more characteristically, he says:

'One day, in a small village in Bengal, an ascetic woman from the neighbourhood came to see me. She had the name "Sarva-khepi" given to her by the village people, the meaning of which is "the woman who is mad about all things." She fixed her star-like eyes upon my face and startled me with the question, "When are you coming to meet me underneath the trees?" Evidently she pitied me who lived (according to her) prisoned behind walls, banished away from the great meeting-place of the All, where she had her dwelling. Just at that moment my gardener came with his basket, and when the woman understood that the flowers in the vase on my table were going to be thrown away, to make place for the fresh ones, she looked pained and said to me, "You are always engaged reading and writing; you do not see." Then she took the discarded flowers in her palms, kissed them and touched them with her forehead, and reverently murmured to herself, "Beloved of my heart." I felt that this woman, in her direct vision of the infinite personality in the heart of all things, truly represented the spirit of India.'

NEW POETRY.

Claude Houghton.

Messrs. Daniel are the publishers of a series of plays for 'A People's Theatre.' Of one of the plays the title is *Judas*, and the author Claude Houghton (3s. 6d. net). It is a powerful play, most unexpectedly moving and even enlightening. Judas is, of course, the villain of the piece, but he is not by any means the villain we have been accustomed to call him. He is an idealist, but without patience. The Kingdom is too long in coming. Christ can bring it, but Judas must force His hand. The idea is not new, but neither Whately nor De Quincey worked it out more impressively than it is worked out here. Especially effective is the character of Ruth, Judas' fiancée. She believes in Jesus, but her love for Judas seems, for a time at least, to overwhelm that.

'Speak not of him.
I would he had not come. Bid him return
To the eternal highway of the heavens:
His love is not our love, his joy not ours—
How should we climb the summit of his hope
To view the smiling splendour of his kingdom?
He is beyond, without, above our reach,
Too fair for our mortality, too fine
For our gross passion: we are of the earth,
Kneaded by nature of earth's earthy clay,
Our passions wax and wane, as seasons pass
Into the years that spell our life and death,
Until our weariness finds peace at last
In earth again. The earth our portion is
As heaven is his birthright. Bid him go.
What shall he say to us, or we to him?
How shall we bear the burthen of his love?
How shall we be as gods? Bid him begone.
He robs our firmament of joy, to dower
An unseen midnight with a spectral glory,
Leaving all dark for us.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.